FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 025 6 February 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Moscow TV Presents 'Repercussions' Program AA 1
[Kalyagin, Karpov, Korniyenko, Falin, Chervov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gromyko, Kissinger Discuss 'Complicated' Ties A 1

CHINA

All-China Conference Views Economic Performance B 1
[Abulkhatin in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 Jan]
'Main Tasks' Outlined B 1
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Jan]
Li Peng Expresses 'Confidence' in Intelligentsia B 2
[Savenkov in IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]
Sinologists' Association Holds Routine Session B 2
[PRAVDA 5 Feb]
Freight Car Export Contract Signed With PRC B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

DPRK Leaders Send Messages to Gromyko, Ryzhkov C 1
DPRK Economic Delegation 9-Day Visit Ends C 1
Japan's Pacific 'Marshall Plan' Questioned C 1
[Anichkin in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jan]
USSR-Japan Fisheries Commission Session Opens C 3
Briefs: DPRK Youth Delegation C 3

SOUTH ASIA

Pakistani Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow D 1
DRA-Pakistan Talks Postponed Till 25 Feb D 1
Katushev Meets DRA Business Delegation Head D 1
Briefs: Indian Industrial Cooperation D 1

EASTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Reports Shevardnadze's Talks in GDR [5 Feb] F 1
Reportage on Shevardnadze's Official CSSR Visit F 3
Met at Airport by Chnoupek F 3
Holds Talks With Chnoupek F 3
'Cordial' Meeting With Husak F 4
Discusses Ties With Strougal F 5
CTK: Interview Published [Prague RUDE PRAVO 6 Feb] F 6
Joint Communique Issued F 7
Airport Send-off by Chnoupek F 10
Returns, Met by Chebrikov F 10
Further Reports on Trip [cross-reference] F 10
Talyzin, Antonov Meet Bulgarian Delegation F 10
[PRAVDA 5 Feb]
Ryabov-led CPSU Delegation Visits Hungary [PRAVDA 31 Jan] F 11
Hungarian Foreign Ministry Official Horn Visits F 11
Confers With Petrovskiy [IZVESTIYA 4 Feb] F 12

WESTERN EUROPE

U.S., UK Agree on Cyprus 'Espionage Stations' G 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Feb]
Supreme Soviet Group Visits Great Britain G 1
Zagladin Comments on Visit G 1
UK Paper 'TODAY' Cited on Secret Spy Satellite G 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Feb]
U.S. Intelligence Runs 'Free Hand' in UK G 3
UK Government Stance on Arms Curbs Examined G 4
[Krivopalov in IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]
Moscow Comments on U.S.-Spain Troop Cut Talks G 5
Deutsche Welle's View on German Attack Slanderous G 6
[Anfilov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jan]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Reportage on Brutents Visit to Mideast H 1
Meets With Syria's Al-Ahmar [PRAVDA 3 Feb]
Views U.S. Naval Buildup H 1
U.S. 'Intervention' in Lebanon [AFP] H 1
U.S. Buildup in Mediterranean, Gulf Viewed [Basiyev] H 2
TASS Cites 'AL-AKHBAR' on U.S. Carrier in Haifa H 3
Joint News Conference With Syrian Astronauts [Damascus] H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Sees U.S., France Fueling Chad Conflict J 1
[Pavlov, 29 Jan]
Anniversary Messages Exchanged With Ghana [IZVESTIYA 24 Jan] J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Argentina Protests UK Zone Around Falklands K 1
IZVESTIYA Views Contadora 'Peace Mission' Outcome K 1
[Silantyev, 23 Jan]

Nicaragua Says Meeting To 'Sabotage' Contadora K 2
Shevardnadze Meets With Contadora Group Members K 2
[Mexico City NOTIMEX]
Reagan Adviser Carlucci Leaves on C. America Tour K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Politburo Discusses Consumer Goods Cooperatives R 1
MVD's Vlasov un Ukrainian Staffers' Punishment R 2
[PRAVDA 30 Jan]
Ukrainian CP CC Politburo Reprimands Ministers R 3
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Jan]
Ukrainian Officials Retire 'For Health Reasons' R 4
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 24 Jan]
New Minister Appointed R 5
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 24 Jan]
Committee Chairman Appointed R 5
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 24 Jan]
Shcherbitskiy Meets Rural Raykom Secretaries R 6
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 25 Jan]
Information Report on Tajik CP CC Plenum R 7
[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 18 Jan]
Economist Interviewed on Gorbachev Reform R 9
[Vienna KURIER]
PRAVDA on Requirement for Greater Democratism R 11
[2 Feb]
Novodevichye Cemetery Reopens to Public R 13
[Grigoryev in MOSCOW NEWS 25 Jan]
Yegorov Reviews Shatrov Series on Lenin R 13
[MOSCOW NEWS 25 Jan]
Paper Notes Efforts To Silence Investigator R 16
[Limonov in SOTSIALITICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 24 Jan]
Tereshkova Elected SOD Chairperson R 16

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Economist Zaslavskaya on Economic, Social Reform S 1
[Zalai in Budapest NEPZABADZAG 24 Jan]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Moscow TV Broadcasts Soyuz TM-2 Launching U 1
Control Center Notes Progress U 3

MOSCOW TV PRESENTS 'REPERCUSSIONS' PROGRAM

LD152210 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Jan 87

[Phone-in program "Repercussions: The Way To A Nuclear-Free World," presented by Boris Kalyagin, with Viktor Karpov, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and chief of the Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament Directorate; Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department; Valentin Falin, chairman of the Board of the Novosti Press Agency; and Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces; video shows Karpov, Korniyenko, Kalyagin, Falin and Chervov seated at tables, with telephonists seated at typewriters placed around the sides of the studio; telephone numbers to be called are displayed on the screen -- live]

[Text] [Kalyagin] Hello, esteemed viewers. Once again we are here with you in the television studio of the "Repercussions" program at Ostankino to answer questions that are of concern to you. The discussion today will deal with the Soviet program for the creation of a nuclear-free world and the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction before the end of the present century, as proposed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement exactly a year ago.

Comrades, I suggest you immediately write down the studio telephone numbers. [telephone numbers displayed on screen] You may call in on any of these numbers. Your question will be received by the stenographers and immediately handed to us. It is desirable that you give your surname, place of residence, and also your profession or workplace.

Now permit me to introduce to you the participants in our program. They are: Viktor Pavlovich Karpov, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and chief of the Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament Directorate; Georgiy Markovich Korniyenko, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the Board of the Novosti Press Agency; and Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. [medium shots of Karpov, Korniyenko, Falin and Chervov]

The title of our program is "Repercussions" -- that is, response and reaction. Perhaps of late no single international document has produced such a broad response throughout the world as has the 15 January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and this is certainly understandable. After all, the statement deals with the fate of mankind and ridding it of the threat of nuclear destruction. This matter concerns everyone.

For the first time ever the statement puts forward a specific and realistic program, which is precisely calculated from the viewpoint of time, for the total elimination everywhere of all types of nuclear weapons before the beginning of the next century. It set the tone, as it were, for International Peace Year, which was declared in 1986. During the ensuing 12 months we gave specific form to the program and reinforced it by practical deeds. That is to say, we did everything possible to see that Peace Year corresponded in fact with its title. So at the present time the significance of this initiative has not only lessened, but has, perhaps, increased even more.

By a symbolic coincidence, precisely today -- the 1st anniversary of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement -- the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms resumed in Geneva. As was pointed out by our senior representatives, the Soviet side will do everything possible to ensure the present round of talks becomes a turning-point and brings closer the possibility of the conclusion of specific accords which would make it possible to terminate the arms race on earth and avert it in space.

I hear that our stenographers are already receiving the first questions. While they are typing the questions and distributing them according to themes, I would like to ask the participants in our program to sum up some of the results of the appraisals made of the statement during the past year. After all, over the past 12 months there appeared a great deal of material, abundant material, which makes it possible to see more clearly the prospects for carrying out our program and the difficulties standing in the way of its implementation.

What in your view was most important in the discussion of the Soviet initiative? You have the floor, Valentin Mikhaylovich.

[Falin] Many things may occur in the future, of course, but whatever the turn of events might be, one thing is certain, namely, that the 15 January statement has become the starting point for a fresh stage in the struggle for a truly democratic and human world in which the peoples would be rid of alarms over their future and security, and able to concentrate on pressing economic and other issues.

The Soviet program for reorganizing the world and for eliminating nuclear and other forms of weapons of mass destruction embodies experience from the only objectively correct standpoint, which is not from the standpoint of just one or other state, and not from the standpoint of just one social system or a single class. The statement embodies the experience of the entire world community. This obviously is one of the main reasons why the 15 January statement met with such a broad response -- and by the standards of real politics, such an unusual response -- and why this statement is still being discussed. This is shown by the statements, pronouncements and commentaries we are witnessing at the present time on the news agency services.

The 15 January statement is a vivid example of new political thinking, and at the same time new political action. In the statement, word and deed, and this is very important, constitute a unified and inseparable whole. Correspondingly the text of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement fully reflects the assessments and conclusions made in 1985 at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. At the meeting, I would remind you, both sides acknowledged that war cannot be a means of settling contentious problems; there can be no winner in a nuclear war and there ought not to be nuclear war or any war at all between our countries. Both sides undertook the commitment not to strive to achieve military superiority and to act to halt the arms race on earth and to avert an arms race in space. This is highly important, and it greatly heartened not only the USSR and the United States and not only the Soviet and American peoples, but also provided some prospects for other peoples of the world and other governments.

Previously it used to be said that if one had the force, one did not need intelligence. This is quite inappropriate now. Now, the more force one has, the more need there is of both intelligence and circumspection. The shortcoming and defects of the obsolete policy of force cannot be compensated for or made good by any of the most up-to-date military technology.

For one to live and for civilization to continue and to develop the possibility of the outbreak of an accidental unpremeditated or premeditated war needs to be ruled out totally and forever, as a war today would be a total and irreversible catastrophe.

Our party defines the current state of development as a turning point in the life of mankind. Security problems are turning from a military problem, more and more into a political problem. The logic of power confrontation, which steps up the arms race, should be replaced by the logic of honest, conscientious cooperation -- a logic in which weapons are not needed at all. Only then will mankind be saved from, insured against, all unexpected events. Only in this way can we ensure that war will forever be a thing of the past. The USSR, in its program proposed on 15 January, which set its sights into the 21st century, demonstrated its readiness not only to turn 1986 into a year of peace, as was proclaimed by the United Nations: The USSR proposed making last year, 1986, the prologue to a bright future undarkened by military conflicts. Mankind has had enough of warring, and that is said clearly in the statement: It has had enough for ever. The sooner this is understood and recoginized, the better it will be for everyone.

[Chervov] Boris Aleksandrovich, would you permit me to stress, from the military point of view, the realistic nature of the Soviet program? Our program is not propaganda. It is not an appeal, nor is it just fine words. It is in fact our practical action. I will give some specific examples. The Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions has been in operation for 18 months. Is that propaganda? No. It is actually an integral part of our program. It is the practical embodiment of the Soviet program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. If the Americans were to join the Soviet moratorium, a major step forward would be taken on the path toward a nuclear-free world. Take another example. The USSR pledged no first use of nuclear weapons. From the military point of view that was no straightforward step to take, but we took it. If the United States joined us and took the same pledge, we could say boldly that the current world situation would be a great deal better.

Take other practical, unilateral steps that we have taken. We removed, dismantled, all the medium-range missile launchers on the Kola Peninsula. We removed from alert status some of the SS-20 medium-range missiles in the European zone. We froze such missiles in Europe. For almost 3 years now the Soviet moratorium on antisatellite systems has been in operation. All of these practical, unilateral steps of ours are an integral part of our program. If the United States and NATO were to respond reciprocally, people would breathe a sign of relief and the world situation would become significantly better. One other consideration: Our program is a realistic one for the additional reason that it is specific. You are all familiar with the program. It designates specific stages, volumes of reduction, and the time of the reduction. It proposed the drawing up of a specific procedure for eliminating nuclear weapons -- both delivery vehicles and warheads. It proposes specific monitoring [kontrol] of all kinds, by national means and also international monitoring in all its forms including on site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh]. In other words, we realize -- and the Soviet leadership is fully aware of this -- that the task of eliminating nuclear weapons is no easy one, but it is a soluble task and can realistically be solved.

[Kalyagin] We have several questions relating to the behaviour of the U.S. delegation in Geneva. Viktor Pavlovich, since you headed the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks, it would probably be best for you to say what the Americans' line was and what can be expected of them now.

[Karpov] The line taken by the U.S. delegation at the talks was, and still, is a combination of support, in words, for the aims and targets formulated on 8 January 1985, and practical proposals diverging from those aims and that program. Let's take specific examples. With regard to space, the task was clearly formulated to prevent an arms race in space. What was proposed by the United States from the very start of the talks? That the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative be considered a guarantee that there would be no arms race in space. Paradoxical as it may be, it's a fact. The U.S. delegation has been trying, under one dressing or another, to drag the Star Wars program through the talks as a means of achieving the aim of preventing an arms race in space. All our proposals -- for a complete ban on space strike arms, a ban on antisatellite systems, a ban on space-to-earth weapons, the strengthening of the ABM Treaty regime -- have in practice received no positive response from the U.S. side. The stakes are being put, as before, on the implementation of Star Wars.

Take the problem of strategic offensive weapons. It's the same thing: The United States says it is also in favor of achieving a reduction in strategic offensive weapons, officially advocating a 50 percent reduction in them over a period of 5 years. If you analyze the U.S. proposals that have been put forward at the talks, you find that in them the recognition of the need to reduce strategic arms is combined with hidden elements which in fact permit the build-up of such weapons. It's not difficult to find an example. There is a proposal by the Soviet side to reduce the number of strategic offensive weapons in the first stage to 6,000 warheads. The United States agrees with this, but in point of fact the position provides for the possibility of deploying -- as the weaponry of strategic bombers and sea-based cruise missiles -- many more thousands of nuclear weapons on strategic delivery vehicles to an overall total of roughly 15,000. So there you have it: One one hand what is said, and on the other what is done.

On medium-range missiles, the United States agreed with our proposal to eliminate these missiles of the United States and the USSR in Europe. In this respect we made some concessions to the United States and agreed also to reduce our medium-range missiles in Asia to 100 warheads. We agreed also that the United States could also have 100 warheads on medium-range missiles on its territory. What does the United States put forward as a condition for solving the problem? The right to have on its territory medium-range missiles in such a way that they can reach the territory of the USSR. In other words, creating an additional threat to the territory of the USSR during the process of the reduction and elimination of medium-range missiles.

So, you have statements on the one hand, and actions on the other. This is very typical of the U.S. position, particularly now, after Reykjavik, when, setting ajar the door to a nuclear-free world, Reykjavik has shown the possibility, the real possibility, of major solutions to the problem of nuclear armaments, the reduction of nuclear armaments, going as far as the elimination of U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive weapons. What do we see from the U.S. side? A retreat from Rejkyavik in all directions. On space, President Reagan gave his agreement at Reykjavik to nonabandonment of the ABM Treaty for 10 years. At the talks -- 10 days had not elapsed when the U.S. representative at Geneva said that the United States could not make an unconditional pledge to this effect, and that all they could do was talk to the USSR and seek agreement on the rules and conditions for abandoning the ABM Treaty during this 10-year period. Instead of the full elimination of strategic offensive weapons, on which an accord was, to all practical purposes, achieved at Reykjavik, the United States is now talking just about the elimination of ballistic missiles, so it continues.

So what we see is an unvarying line. It could be regarded as enviable constancy if it were not for the fact it is directed against the performance of tasks which are essential and which must be performed to achieve the goals facing the talks.

[Kalyagin] Georgiy Markovich, I can see you already have several questions there. Perhaps you could make a start on replying to them.

[Korniyenko] Yes, I have a whole set of questions. (Yuriy Vladimirovich Nishchenko) from Moscow, a builder by profession, asks: How will our government act if the United States tests a nuclear weapon in Nevada on 5 February?

The Soviet Government, as one knows, gave advance warning last December that considerations of the security of the USSR and its allies would not permit us to continue unilaterally adhering to the moratorium if the United States does not join it, and that after the first U.S. nuclear blast in 1987 we will be forced to resume testing. The reply that follows from this is as follows: If -- as Comrade (Nishchenko) says in his question -- on 5 February or some other date the U.S. Government carries out the latest blast, nuclear tests will also be resumed in the USSR. I should like to add that the same Soviet Government statement said in clear and precise terms that the USSR will be prepared at any moment to break off its nuclear test program if the United States at long last decides to halt its nuclear blasts.

(Chekanov), a student, also from Moscow, has sent in the following question: Of late the USSR seems to have been counting on the mood of the U.S. Congress in its statements on disarmament matters. For instance, our extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests is evidently linked to the possibility of the U.S. Congress halting finance for these tests. What is the mood in the Congress at the present time?

To assess the mood in Congress I think it would be enough to cite the fact that on 6 January the 1st day of proceedings in the U.S. Congress of the new session, three draft resolutions were presented in the House of Representatives. One resolution, if adopted, will prohibit the government from testing nuclear weapons with a yield exceeding 1 kilotonne. The second resolution prohibits breaches of the ABM Treaty: Specifically, it prohibits the testing and deployment of space-based ABM systems. The third resolution calls for observance of the SALT-II treaty. This unquestionably characterizes the mood in Congress. Whether the backers of these resolutions manage to put these resolutions through and when this is going to happen is another matter. But to assess the mood, I repeat, these are telling facts.

There is the following question from Comrade (Nazarov): Will there be a summit this year, and why should our leader travel to the United States? It would be better for Reagan to come to our country. Perhaps he would then change his attitude to our country.

Will a meeting take place? As before, we reply to this question unambiguously. Such a meeting -- that is, Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to the United States -- can take place if the necessary conditions exist for it, and above all if there is a guarantee that the meeting will end with concrete and substantial results, first and foremost in the sphere agreed at the Geneva meeting: The sphere of halting the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space. Why should Mikhail Sergeyevich travel to the United States and not the other way round? It was arranged at Geneva that the first visit would be paid to the United States and subsequently the U.S. President would travel to the USSR. We always adhere to the accords we have made.

[Kalyagin] Comrade (Yuriy Sergeyevich Sagakov) from Kuybyshev expresses surprise as to why programs like "Repercussions" devote so little attention to the financial problem, in particular the links between SDI and the financial-industrial [as heard] complex. Well, I would say that in our programs we do pay attention to this problem, stressing that attempts to implement SDI can be put down in part to pressure form the military-industrial complex, which, I think, will have guaranteed profits -- if the plan goes ahead -- for the next 30 years. As far as our own program, "Repercussions," is concerned, our job is to reply to your questions, space comrades, your specific questions, and we have pleasure in replying specifically on the link between SDI and the financial-industrial complex.

I should like Valentin Mikhaylovich to reply to these questions from (Sergey Valentinovich Shevtsov), a junior scientific worker from Moscow, who asks: What is the link between nuclear disarmament questions and humanitarian questions? What proposals on humanitarian questions did we take to Reykjavik?

[Falin] Like everything in life, these things are interlinked. There is no formal link, but there is a de facto one. As regards Reykjavik and the ideas on humanitarian issues which we took with us and the question of what could be settled there along with other matters, one could put it briefly as follows: An improvement in contacts between the population and people of the USSR and the population and people of the United States, between specific groups, professional groups, and an improvement in exchanges of information. In this context the Soviet side proposed certain ideas which would make it possible to provide the American public with more specific and concrete information of this sort. In essence, the majority of Americans are cut off from all objective information about the USSR. For a number of reasons, Americans -- if one takes the majority, the mass of Americans -- are unable to receive our radio broadcasts or watch our television programs. There are at best episodes, at best exceptions. I shall say nothing of the fact that very few Americans, as a percentage of the population, know the Russian language, they cannot read literature in Russian, listen to our Russian broadcasts or watch our movies. If one compares the number of American movies shown in the USSR with the number of Soviet movies shown in the United States, there are 20 times more of the former, or an even higher ratio. The same thing, incidentally, goes for the number of books by American authors published in our country or of Soviet and Russian authors there, respectively.

A review was also made of a number of issues concerning resumption of scientific cooperation and cultural exchanges, and our positions were drawn closer together on these. The question of reuniting families was examined on a working basis, and so forth. In short, if the Reykjavik meeting had ended productively on the main topics, it would undoubtedly have been accompanied by no less, or the same, or a similar success on all the other problems, which comprise part of the relations between the countries, part of the relations between the peoples of our countries.

[Kalyagin] We are not an equal footing with our television viewers: They can see us, we cannot see them. Soon, probably, we shall be using videotelephones, and then we shall be able to both hear and see our interlocutor. For the time being, however, we nevertheless have the possibility of meeting some of our viewers on the screen. True, we recorded their questions in advance. Are our producers ready to run the video film? [video shows crowd scene, close-up of three people in outdoor winter clothing]

[Begin video recording] [Alekseyev] Alekseyev, Leonid Alekseyevich, from the town of Brest, agricultural worker. I would like to know whether one can, in the year ahead, hope for a reduction of the two military political groups, the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

[Alekseyeva] Alekseyeva, Olga Zakharovna, German language teacher. I am interested in whether one can hope for an improvement in relations with the FRG regardless of the United States?

[Girl] My name is Tatyana. I would like to ask the following question: What is it that hampers the young people of the United States from understanding our young people? [end recording]

[Kalyagin] Over to you.

[Chervov] The first question -- can one hope for an agreement on reducing the groupings of armed forces in Europe? First, it should be said that reaching an agreement on reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe is possible and essential to curtail, to lessen, the level of dangerous military confrontation. But time waits for no man. Unfortunately, the United States and the NATO countries are in no hurry to resolve this problem. They even refuse direct contacts on coordinating disarmament issues. In particular, they have refused direct contacts between groups of experts of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, between Marshal of the Soviet Union Georgiyevich Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact, and General Rogers, Commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of NATO. They have refused a meeting between the general secretaries of the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO.

At present the NATO leaders are putting forward preliminary conditions: The elimination of the alleged imbalance in conventional weapons which, they say, exists in the Warsaw Pact's favor. Only after this, they say, will it be possible to reach an agreement on reducing troops and weapons. In fact, there is no imbalance. The leaders of the West, of the appropriate ranks, are well aware of this.

The obstacles being raised by the United States and the NATO countries on this issue create a sort of vicious circle. They are now declaring that nuclear weapons cannot be cut, because, they say, conventional weapons must be cut; but it is not possible to reduce conventional weapons at present, either, since insurmountable artificial obstructions are being created on their part.

Can one, all the same, hope an agreement may be reached? One can, if the United States and the NATO countries take up realistic positions and make countersteps in response to the Warsaw Pact countries Budapest appeal.

[Kalyagin] The second question was probably for you, Valentin Mikhailovich.

[Falin] Can one count on an improvement in relations with the FRG regardless of our relations with the United States?

I should like to draw attention to the following: Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement of 15 January last year is addressed to no specific country, to no specific group of countries. The statement stresses that it is addressed to all states of the world, to all responsible parties, to all public organizations, to all people of good will.

Of course, we would welcome an improvement in relations with every country, large and small, whether a European state or not. We would also welcome an improvement in relations with European countries, and the FRG is no exception to this, of course. If the FRG considered it possible, useful and expedient for itself actively to support the constructive proposals of the USSR aimed toward ridding Europe, too, of nuclear weapons, and for a profound reduction in conventional weapons on that continent, this would undoubtedly have the most positive effect on the state of and prospects for our relations with that state.

I would like to draw attention to another aspect of the matter. In advocating good relations with all countries, we do not consider it right that as a result of this or that vacillation in the relations between the USSR and the United States, in particular a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations, a deterioration in Soviet relations with some NATO countries should occur by virtue of the specific nature of the Western bloc. Due to solidarity -- probably not always correctly understood, and perhaps always incorrectly understood -- many NATO governments approve in advance all sorts of vacillations and negative changes in Washington's position; this naturally cannot but incur the corresponding deterioration in our relations with them. Therefore, to give stability to these relations, to endow these relations with clear prospects for the future, a sounder basis oriented more to the long-term must be created. Care must be taken to ensure that this basis is less subject to all sorts of circumstantial and climatic, in the political sense, influences.

If I may, I would like to say a word or two on the third question: Why do such difficulties arise for American young people in understanding the USSR and Soviet people, our thinking, and everything that happens in our country. You know, there are some very worrying aspects which one cannot fail to take into account and which one should not fail to evaluate seriously. For instance, there is a poll by the famous Gallop Institute, according to which only 4 percent of Americans believe in Darwin's theory about the evolution of every living thing; 44 percent of Americans think that life, everything on earth, occurred at the command and under the guidance of divine authority; about 39 percent of those polled assume that although evolution did take place, it was not without the assistance of the Most High. This is a result of the existing system of education in U.S. secondary schools.

The second aspect to which attention has been drawn, or to which one should pay attention, is that the U.S. military-industrial complex, which we sometimes refer to in passing, has bought up and controls the majority of school textbook publishing houses. It bought up not just any old publishing houses, but precisely those which in great measure program the thoughts and ideas and aspirations of young Americans. Thereby it programs for the future just how these Americans should regard their own -- from the viewpoint of the military-industrial complex -- potential enemies.

Were we simply to brush aside these facts we would probably fail to understand a great deal of what has happened; and if we do brush these facts aside, we will probably not be able to understand why Americans find it so difficult to come to terms with the fact that the time for the policy of force has passed, and has passed for good.

[Korniyenko] I would like to add something to this: Valentin Mikhailovich cited the percentages of those who believe in man's divine origin and those who believe in Darwin's theory.

But I think it would be appropriate to recall another recent poll taken in the United States; it relates to young people, too, when only 28 percent of all those polled, and even less than that among young folk, gave the right answer, to the effect that in the Second World War the United States and the USSR were on the same side against Hitlerite Germany; 28 percent also replied that the USSR and the United States fought one another in the Second World War; while 46 percent of the rest quite honestly admitted that they did not know who fought on which side. This shows how politically illiterate, to put it mildly, young American people are. Not all of them, of course. It suffices to recall such a very young American girl as Samantha Smith, and the way that our young emissaries were received in the United States. Young people vary. But unfortunately, the majority of young Americans really cannot be said to be sufficiently politically oriented, politically mature, or capable of understanding what worries Soviet young people and causes us anxiety.

[Kalyagin] Viktor Pavlovich, I see you have a lot of questions there. In the meantime, I will ask all those taking part in the meeting to try and be brief, so as to fully answer as many questions as possible.

[Karpov] Engineer (Aleksandr Viktorovich Semayev) from Moscow, poses a very serious question. Does it not seem to you that in the event of an agreement being reached at Reykjavik, we would in 10 years' time have ended up weaponless in the face of such countries as wittingly failed to join in the nuclear disarmament process?

The fact is that our program of 15 January cannot be separated from the nuclear disarmament program, from what was discussed in Reyjkavik. Reykjavik is a part of our nuclear disarmament program, and is to a certain degree a means of realizing that program. Our program envisages as the first stage of nuclear disarmament a 50 percent cut in the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the United States; while in subsequent stages, all the nuclear powers are to join the USSR and United States in this matter, that of eliminating nuclear weapons. So that at the third stage, a system of a nuclear-free world is already being established, with the appropriate guarantees against the revival of nuclear weapons. Reykjavik compressed this program into shorter periods, but the program remains a guide for action; and precisely within this framework, within the framework of this program, there can be guaranteed a nuclear-free world, with no detriment to the security of all those participating in it.

Here's another question relating to nuclear tests. It is asked by biologist (Eduard Alekseyevich Meshcherikov) from Moscow. It is known that Reagan has just submitted to the U.S. Congress two treaties, on underground nuclear tests and on peaceful nuclear explosions on the condition that the USSR permits the United States to carry out inspections at the nuclear test sites. The point is, the Soviet Government has already given agreement to monitoring [kontrol] Soviet nuclear testing grounds, so what further agreement is Reagan demanding?

It should be pointed out that submission to the U.S. Congress of these two agreements -- of 1974 and 1976, signed at that time, but still not ratified through the fault of the United States -- is a political ruse, an attempt to show that the U.S. Government is trying to undertake something to proceed toward if not a total cessation of nuclear tests, at least to some sort of limitation of those tests.

But a condition is stipulated here: The working out of a completely different type of system of monitoring [kontrol] from that provided for in those treaties; and this condition is a tough one, which requires the establishment of a monitoring system on the basis of the Cortex system proposed by the Americans, in effect, on-site monitoring, at the site of the explosions.

It should be said that we are in favor of the system for monitoring the cessation of nuclear tests being as effective as possible. We are ready to negotiate this. We are also ready to conduct negotiations with the U.S. side aimed at the cessation of nuclear tests. We could proceed to this by stages. For instance, by means of reducing the number of explosions carried out, by means of a sharp reduction in the power threshold of the tests carried out. We are at the same time ready to talk about further perfecting the monitoring system [usovershenstvovaniye sistemy kontrolya]. But what the President is proposing now as a condition for ratification of the treaties is, in essence, the legalization of nuclear tests, and a large-scale nuclear tests at that, because the Cortex system is incapable of monitoring explosions below a certain power -- shall we say a few tens of kilotonnes.

[Kalyagin] Nikolay Fedorovich, there are a lot of questions dealing with military topics.

[Chervov] Yes, indeed, there are many such questions. I will start with questions relating to nuclear tests. Comrade (Nikolay Platonovich Magar), a war veteran, from No 19, Ulitsa Gogolya, in the town of Glukhov in Sumy Oblast, poses the following question. Starting from December last month, representatives of the White House administration, of various ranks, including the President himself, have been openly stating that they will continue test explosions. Why then are we, knowing this, waiting for their first explosion? We have got so behind them in this respect, to the extent of over 500 days. Are not such steps dangerous for our state? Comrade (Alla Ivanovna Gerasimenko) from Moscow, asks: Are we, in the past 1 and 1/2 years, greatly behind in the testing of nuclear weapons?

Firstly it should be said that our Soviet moratorium, which we have now been observing for over 1 and 1/2 years, has two aspects -- the political aspect and the military aspect. Regarding the political aspect, by continuing to test nuclear weapons the United States is revealing itself to the whole world as an instigator of the arms race. It is pursuing a course aimed at achieving military superiority and at attempting to upset the military parity that now exists. The whole world can now see the source of the military threat to the world. Therefore, at the political level, we have certainly gained substantially. As for the military aspect, the objective situation is this. When one side has been testing nuclear weapons for 1 and 1/2 years, and the other side has not been testing them and its test sites have been silent, there is naturally a falling behind. However, to date this lagging behind has been permissible. To date, the USSR's security has not been put under threat. We are attentively watching the Pentagon's behavior and we know with whom we are dealing. The Soviet leadership is all the time carefully assessing the situation and analyzing it. As a result there is the Soviet Government statement regarding the decision to further extend the Soviet moratorium in 1987 until the first U.S. nuclear explosion.

In this connection there is also a question from Comrade (Smirnov), an economist living in Moscow. Why was it reported in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, and moreover, only in that newspaper, that the Americans had put their 133d bomber into service -- that is, their third over the limit? Since we are all the time some 5-10 years behind the Americans in all types of armament, as has been reported in all the Soviet press publications, even in ICBMs with multiple warheads, and we are all the time trying to persuade the Americans to halt nuclear weapons testing, while they are continuing testing, will it not be 1941 yet again?

This anxiety is natural. I have already spoken of the Soviet Government decision regarding the moratorium. As for the USSR being some 5-10 years behind, the situation is as follows. The U.S. has been conducting an arms race. Beginning from 1945 it has been continuously creating new kinds and classes of strategic and other kinds of armaments. The USSR has only been taking countermeasures in the interests of safeguarding its security. We are not conducting an arms race. For this reason we are objectively forced into taking countermeasures to get to some extent behind the United States in the development of our armaments and this or that kind of weapon. It needs to be said that a military-strategic parity now exists between the United States and the USSR, and we will not permit the United States to upset this parity, including in the sphere of testing nuclear weapons. It must be said that those measures the United States is planning and carrying out in the arms race oblige us servicemen of the Soviet armed forces to be on the alert and to display high viligance. Our country's security is, for us, a sacred cause, and the men of the Soviet Armed Forces see it as their duty to the people to reliably defend their socialist homeland and to be in a constant readiness guaranteeing the immediate rebuff of any aggressor. It may be boldly asserted in a most responsible way that there will be no repetition of 1941.

(Mariya Fedorovna Kulikova), a teacher, who is now a pensioner, from Moscow, asks this: Is there a realistic possibility of U.S. military superiority over the USSR? No, such a possibility does not exist and this will not happen, In present-day conditions this is impossible. The USSR and the United States are both states that will not permit any military superiority over each other -- neither U.S. military superiority over the USSR, nor Soviet military superiority over the United States. The state of the economies and the military-technological potential of the sides are such that it is now impossible to achieve military superiority. I will give you a simple example. Beginning in 1941, the United States has been conducting an arms race and has spent billions of dollars on its military programs. But what has it achieved? Has its security been strengthened and has it achieved military superiority? No, military superiority has not been achieved, and its security has not only failed to be increased, but has indeed been lessened. This is how it will continue.

[Kalyagin] Thank you, Nikolay Fedorivich. (Savinova), an engineer from Moscow, asks the following: She says that for the past few years there have been meetings between the Soviet and American public via various telebridges. Is such a meeting possible between the leaders of the United States and the USSR on questions of nuclear arms? Well, there is an agreement for a meeting of representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress, and I think that if relations develop, then probably meetings at a higher level are in principle possible. I can see that a lot of questions have come in concerning the policy of the U.S. Administration. Georgiy Markovich, that's your subject.

[Korniyenko] Comrade (Busin), a journalist asks: What has changed in the views of President Reagan in the year that has passed since the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was published? Have any positive moves appeared regarding that statement? I would say that in the year that has passed since last 15 January, certain changes have taken place. That was shown by Reykjavik. Yes, Mr Reagan did come to Reykjavik with the old baggage, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said there, in Reykjavik. During the Reykjavik meeting he did, in the final analysis, go out to achieve accords. What happened, as we all know, was that questions relating to strategic offensive weapons and medium-range missiles were agreed in principle. That was a move forward. That was a change, and a positive one. Yet that agreement was wrecked due to the President's adherence to his SDI space program. In addition, the President was called to order, and after Reykjavik the U.S. side also went back on the question of strategic arms and medium-range missiles. Nonetheless, the January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich did have an effect, and not everything is the same as it was a year ago.

Linked with this is, I would say, another question from Comrade (Rekeza), a war veteran from Moscow, who asks: Why not suggest to Gorbachev that he and Reagan sign the two points in the accord on arms reduction on which mutual understanding was achieved at Reykjavik, and then reach an accord on SDI afterward to eliminate it altogether? Well, the answer to this question must be that if it was not possible in Reykjavik to agree on a comprehensive solution to the issues, including the issue of SDI, without which it was impossible to come to an agreement, then what hope could there be that afterward the President would agree separately on SDI? It would be naive to think that.

[Karpov] Excuse me, but I've got a question here from Saratov, from (Yuriy Vladimirovich Gavrilchev), also on roughly the same subject. He asks: The fact that the United States will implement the SDI program, or will at least try to take it to the end, we have understood. Isn't it a mistake to refuse to sign a treaty eliminating earth-based nuclear weapons? Why have two big sticks in the future instead of one? We know the official viewpoints of our government, but I would like to hear your personal opinion. My personal opinion is that if we follow the same path the United States intends to follow, and engage in the arms race in space, this will in no way lead to the strengthening of our security. For many years now, 25 years, our security and the strategic mutual relationship existing between the USSR and the United States have been preserved because we, primarily through the deployment of our ICBMs, have made the United States vulnerable to a counterstrike by us. If we scrap that possibility, and if at the same time the United States is engaged in deploying weapons in space, that will in no way mean the strengthening of our security. That is why we cannot agree to ignore the U.S. Star Wars program and engage in the reduction of Soviet strategic arms. My point of view on this is that we don't need any second big stick. We should not blindly copy the U.S. Star Wars program. We will take measures -- Nikolay Fedorovich Ghervov can probably explain better than I how we can do it -- measures that will make the U.S. SDI program ineffective in achieving superiority over the USSR. That we will do, but we will not be copying the Americans by creating a big stick in space like the United States is. We don't need it. We have no intention of dealing a first strike against the United States, and an arms race in space will mean increasing the danger of war.

[Kalyagin] Here's another question: Isn't the program for eliminating nuclear weapons utopian? What would happen in a nuclear-free world if an aggressive nuclear power, for example Israel, came forward? Valentin Mikhaylovich?

[Falin] Of course, any promising idea can be declared utopian, but that doesn't mean that we can thereby deny objective facts which exist unbeknown to us, or which will exist regardless of whether we reach an agreement or not. The question is: Is it possible to create, to build, a nuclear-free world? I would like to remind you this question was around back in 1945, and the initiative to prevent a nuclear arms race came from the USSR. It was rejected by the United States, which then had the monopoly, and which counted on keeping that monopoly for the next 15-20 years. Of course, it cannot be ruled out, and there is certain information to indicate, that a number of countries are secretly preparing to produce nuclear weapons, or are already producing these weapons, or at least the components for these weapons. Among these countries is Israel. It is clear that the Soviet-U.S. accord on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons presupposes cooperation in this process among other countries -- both those which already possess nuclear weapons and the potential possessors of nuclear weapons. It is quite clear that the United States would be the first not to accept the principle of a nuclear-free world if, for example, Israel had nuclear weapons. But the force of public opinion, the force of the United Nations and the force of the world community are sufficient to prevent the processes that are presupposed in this question. Finally, when we speak of eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, what is meant of course is not a limited number of nuclear weapons -- a few tens or even hundreds.

There are now such colossal destructive capabilities: They are concentrated primarily in the hands of the USSR and the United States -- or rather the other way around, in the hands of the United States and the USSR -- and if the USSR and the United States come to an agreement, are able to come to an agreement, this will undoubtedly have the most far-reaching effect on the position of other countries.

[Kalyagin] I see you've still got a lot of questions there.

[Falin] I've still got a lot of questions, yes, and there are a number of questions which continue or echo the questions on SDI that have already been asked. Comrade (Dmitry Aleksandrovich Melovitskiy) from Voronezh, a war veteran; to some extent the same question from an engineer who has just given his first name, Aleksey, from Moscow; and others. They also talk about SDI, saying that perhaps we shouldn't insist on reaching an accord on SDI, but should agree on what we can agree on. This is what I would like to say on this point. SDI, in the form announced by the U.S. President in March 1983, has a history of its own. As far as it is known today, the first discussion in the U.S. Administration of the plan for an arms race in space took place not in 1983, but in February 1981. That discussion took place not with a view to countering some sort of Soviet threats, but with a view to restoring U.S. military superiority.

I also want to draw attention to the first public statements on this subject -- Weinberger was, of course, among the first: In June 1981 he declared that if the work being carried out in the United States to create [sozdaniye] ABM weapons gives the Americans more of a guarantee than the currently valid ABM Treaty, the United States would, without hesitation, withdraw from the treaty. At the time, by the way, the United States and the administration were not talking about any imaginary violations on the part of the Soviet Union. At the time, there was not talk at all about whether the treaty permitted or did not permit the Americans to conduct the work they were conducting. This was all unnecessary. At the time, the administration was altogether of the view that there would be not talks with the Soviet Union on any matters related to arms control and disarmament. This came later as a concession both to U.S. public opinion and to the United States's own NATO allies. That is why if one is to be precise, from start to finish, and to the present day, SDI is no defense system, but it is the American way of performing strategic tasks connected with the illusion of the reinstatement of U.S. military superiority. Thus, when the propose we agree about everything else but leave SDI to one side, this is equivalent to our sanctioning the United States' unilateral efforts to achieve this goal which is quite unacceptable to us, a goal which demands an appropriate response. There is another side to the coin. You may recall that in March 1983 Reagan declared SDI necessary to render nuclear weapons harmless, to make them pointless. Our program -- and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev drew President Reagan's attention to this aspect at Reykjavik -- would mean that there will be no nuclear weapons, so why is SDI necessary? Thus, again the Americans have not been saying what they really think. That is an extra reason to take a serious attitude toward this intention of theirs.

Within the framework of SDI, as it is called , the Americans are now working on -- they are testing -- devices which are to provide them with third-generation nuclear weapons, with weapons based on physical principles which are unknown and as yet untested -- offensive weapons destroying targets thousands of kilometers away. This very fact shows that the weapons we are talking about cannot be defensive. These weapons will create fresh, certainly not smaller and perhaps even greater, dangers than the nuclear weapons which currently exist. So what is the sense in replacing the present threat of nuclear weapons with an even greater threat? There is no logic here. When there is no logic it means there is some sort of concealed interests behind a person's stance, behind his actions.

Now that you've given me the microphone, here are brief replies to a number of other questions. Do all the NATO countries support SDI, which the United States is pursuing under Reagan's leadership? This question is from (Kirill Alekseyevich Ivanov), from Kursk. The answer is that no, not all countries support SDI, although admittedly these are in the main the small NATO countries -- Norway, Denmark, Greece, Spain, and some others. They have expressed their disagreement with this program and have spoken out against participation in the implementation of a program of this sort. I would say that many large countries finally joined in this program only with major reservations and under very strong pressure from Washington, because they are well aware of the fact that if the 1972 ABM Treaty ceases to function, this will cancel out the existing -- and I stress, the currently existing -- possibility of resolving the problem of the reduction and subsequent destruction of strategic nuclear weapons. There is an understanding of this, but as a result of the customs prevailing in the context of NATO, countries are afraid of saying this. That is why the governments of certain Western European countries, in particular, are maneuvering; they cannot tell their people how things really are.

Now another question which seems to me to be quite interesting. It is asked by Muscovite (Spassovskiy, Konstantin Vladimirovich), a pensioner. Are the current deteriorations in Soviet-U.S. relations not linked with the improvement in the economic situation in the Soviet Union? Is it not this the Reagan Administration is afraid of?

I would formulate the question somewhat differently, and the reply to it likewise somewhat differently. If we turn to U.S. Government documents, we can read in them -- in particular documents of 1982 -- that the point of the arms race unleashed by the Americans consists in placing the Soviet Union in an extremely difficult economic situation, to exhaust and ruin the Soviet Union, as they put it. Former President Carter once said: 500 grams less meat - no, 50 grams less meat on the table of the Soviet working man is the victory of U.S. policy. Many officials in the current administration are guided to an even greater degree by roughly these ideas, which define the meaning and content of the success of U.S. policy. They seek their gain in our loss. They want to impose upon us such a rate and scale in the arms race, and a race in such spheres, that they calculate we will have difficulty in catching up to the Americans; and due to the weight of these burdensome expenditures -- and we must admit it is burdensome -- we shall find it harder to realize the socioeconomic programs adopted by our communist party.

[Kalyagin] I would like to offer you two more questions which we recorded in advance. Our policy is full of concern for young people. At the same time, the problems of war and people worry not only adults but also young people, working people, students. Therefore we shall offer them the opportunity of putting a number of questions to you. We shall ask our producer to run the videotype.

[Begin recording; video shows crow of young people; first a young man in uniform and then a young school boy address camera]

[Shepovalov] Suvorov cadet Shepovalov, Spartak. The question I am interested in is this: What is the technology for destroying nuclear munitions, and can they be used for peaceful purposes?

[Ladoshkin] I am from Kazan. My name is (Tolya), surname (Ladoshkin). What interests me is this: Everyone is talking about disarmament, and in the United States they are fighting for disarmament too. So can Reagan himself do it, or is some one pushing him into not disarming, frightening him with something. He's the boss of the United States; after all. [end recording] [laughter]

[Kalyagin] Well, I think Comrade General will answer the Suvorov cadet.

[Chervov] The second question, too. Good man, I shall tell Comrade Suvorov Cadet outright that this is an interesting question, and not a very simple one. However, the Soviet program provides for the solution of this question. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement says that to solve this task, special procedures will be developed [razrabotanny] for the destruction of nuclear weapons, including nuclear munitions, and also for dismantling and re-equipping or destroying launchers. Applied to nuclear munitions, these procedures would relate separately both to nuclear and nonnuclear components of the nuclear weapon. Of course, there should be reliable verification [kontrol] of the destruction of nuclear weapons, and here, of course, on-site inspection is needed.

Technology for the destruction of nuclear weapons, including nuclear munitions, has been developed at the talks of the interested parties. In this connection I am answering the second part of your question also. One must not rule out the transfer of a certain part of the released nuclear materials for civilian sectors of the economy. But after appropriate treatment, of course. This answers the first question. As for the second question, perhaps you will link it, Georgiy Markovich, with the military-industrial complex?

[Korniyenko] Well, I think that what is being done by the Soviet Union, the program that lies at the root of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January, is an appeal to common sense, human reason. This is the real way to find a solution to the disarmament problem. If one embarks on the path of frightening each other, as it were, we will do this, whereas the other side will say that they will do something else -- this is the path of the arms race. It has not produced anything good, and in the future it is liable to lead to a still worse situation.

[Kalyagin] Have you any more questions?

[Korniyenko] There are many questions here.

[Kalyagin] I would only like to warn that we have only 8 minutes left. Therefore, let us give not longer than 3 minutes to each participant.

[Unidentified speaker] There are masses of questions.

[Kalyagin] Nothing can be done about it.

[Korniyenko] Comrade Leonid Petrovich Gerasimov, an engineer from Moscow, asks why U.S. workers have an interest in the production of weapons as in having a job to avoid becoming one of the millions, many millions of unemployed in the United States. Comrade (Besedin), a scientific worker, asks whether one can count on the ability of the Democratic Congress to restrain the militarist ambitions of the Reagan Administration. I would like to give a positive answer to this question based on the mere fact the previous composition of the Congress in which Republicans had the majority in the Senate curbed the appetites of the administration by reducing the administration's requests for military spending by $28 billion. Now that the Democrats have the majority in both houses of the Congress -- although one must state the reservation that Democrats vary; they cannot all be tarred with the same brush, but nor can the Republicans -- but I think that there will be a great deal of fighting over the $300 billion military budget which has been introduced by the administration.

I also think this budget will be cut. Can it happen that the Reagan administration will opt for some considerable compromises in the areas of nuclear disarmament in 1988 for pre-election purposes. This question is asked by the same viewer. I would give this brief reply: Let us hope that it will. It will if there is a real aspiration to find considerable compromises, that is, to reach substantial accords. For the present, unfortunately, there are no such signs. Everything that is being done by the administration today does not yet indicate this.

Comrade (Konkov) asks why our Soviet Government continuously makes large concessions in such important questions as international detente and national security, whereas the U.S. Government does not make any concessions to us. Yes, we are making great concessions. But these concessions are to common sense and to enabling mankind to continue living, not to somebody in the United States, be it the U.S. President or someone else. There is a limit to these concessions, beyond which we really cannot go without damaging our security. SDI represents such a limit. Without an accord on SDI, that is, without an accord on the prevention of the arms race in space, we cannot and will not embark on those accords which could be reached on other parts of the problem. There are no grounds, therefore, to fear that we will so to speak, step over this limit. All these questions are being weighed up by the Soviet leadership very, very scrupulously.

[Kalyagin] Well, Viktor Pavlovich, could you choose the most interesting questions.

[Karpov] (Mikhail Mikhailovich Tretilov), an engineer from Moscow is asking this question: Why can't we introduce space borders in the same way as we have airspace boundaries, to prevent enemy space stations from being situated in space above us. We believe space should be the common property of mankind and should be used for peaceful purposes. This is what we are fighting for, and we have proposals on the subject, which have been formulated by our chairman of the Council of Ministers in his letter to Perez de Cuellar. We advocate peace in space. This is a better solution than dividing space into pieces.

If I may put them briefly, there are some more questions. Can one hope for success in the Geneva talks? I personally do not believe in them, Comrade (Yershov), from the city of Vladimir, says. Comrade (Merkulov), from Moscow, also asks whether the members of the Soviet delegation had a feeling of devastation when all our positive proposals on disarmament were in practice adamantly opposed, and whether all the members of the U.S. delegation have a negative attitude towards our proposals.

[Kalyagin] Well, this is subtle.

[Karpov] Yes, I think we should not approach the questions of the talks from the point of view of whether or not we have patience. We have a noble purpose. The Soviet participants in the talks have this purpose in front of them: They are prepared to do all that is incumbent upon them for this purpose to achieve success in the talks. But ultimately we are banking on common sense taking the upper hand in the U.S. administration and making it possible to hold a practical conversation about concrete agreements.

[Kalyagin] We have 2 minutes left, and I want to say our program is being received by Czechoslovak television.

(Vlastimil Nesrsta), international affairs commentator of Czechoslovak television, asks the following question: It is still necessary to do a great deal for the implementation of the Soviet proposals put forward in the statement of Comrade Gorbachev. How can other countries help to implement the colossal program for a nuclear-free world. Valentin Mikhaylovich, please.

[Falin] One can answer by quoting the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev from the statement of 15 January. The contribution of every state and every person is invaluable for a nuclear-free planet to become reality and for a nuclear-free world to take a concrete shape. In this connection, the close and active cooperation of our socialist countries is a very, very important factor on the path toward the attainment of this goal, the attainment of this goal in a very difficult -- as it is now understood by everyone -- struggle, considering the position of the United States and some of their imperialist allies. I would like to use these remaining seconds of the program...

[Kalyagin, interrupting] Thirty seconds.

[Falin]...in order to answer the following question: Can one envisage positive development in the position of the United States and of the FRG? As to the United States, I would like to say this: The position of the United States has so far resembled the flu virus. Regrettably, it has not been changing for the better, and it has been very difficult to find concrete means to achieve anything with the United States.

[Unidentified speaker] Let us not be pessimists.

[Falin] Let us not.

[Kalyagin] Well, comrades, we have to be drawing the program to a close. I would like to say that many letters addressed to us express support for the statement of the Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and our party. There is support, for example, in the note of Comrade (Petr Dmitriyevich Shkarupin), from Krasnoarmeysk, a participant of the great fatherland war from 22 July 1941 and in the note dictated by (Aleksandr Yefimovich Lev), a driver from the town of Lyubertsy. These notes confirm again, of course, the wide support enjoyed by our peaceful initiative and its topicality.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to answer all the questions within the limits of our program, but I would like to assure you that these questions are not going to be left without a reply. We will definitely come back to them in subsequent editions of the "Repercussions" program, in such programs as "World Today," and other programs on international affairs.

I would like now to thank our television viewers for their active participation, and the participants in our program for their profound, thorough and yet fairly concise replies. See you again on the air.

GROMYKO, KISSINGER DISCUSS 'COMPLICATED' TIES

LD051241 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 5 Feb 87

["Kremlin meeting" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, received former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger at the latter's request. Henry Kissinger is staying in Moscow with a group of prominent politicians and statesmen of the USA at the invitation of the USA and Canada Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Andrey Gromyko called the guest's attention to the documents of the January plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on the problems of restructuring and the party's personnel policy. This plenum was an event of special importance and the decisions it took will undoubtedly have a great influence on the implementation of the strategic policy charted by the 27th congress of the CPSU both in the home and foreign policy fields.

During a conversation, held in a frank and businesslike atmosphere, A.A. Gromyko noted the absence of any progress on a number of basic issues of Soviet-American relations in view of the obstacles raised by the American administration in the way of their solution. As a result the present state of relations between the USSR and the USA remains complicated and causes concern.

The Soviet Union comes out for achievement of mutually acceptable accords on arms limitation and disarmament and strives for ending the arms race and preventing it from spreading to space. The Soviet side came up with the idea of carrying out an all-embracing programme of building a nuclear-free world, delivering mankind from other weapons of mass destruction, reducing conventional armaments and creating a security system for all.

Unfortunately, Andrey Gromyko stressed, we do not see on the American side a desire to go ahead and build relations in a new way on the basis of what was achieved during the Geneva and Reykjavik meetings. On the contrary, it shows the intention to aggravate relations. The latest example of this is the new nuclear explosion in the American testing range, staged on February 3. The U.S. Administration actually tore up the SALT-II Treaty and is moving to break out of ABM accords and taking practical steps to carry out the SDI program, i.e. to militarize space. On the whole, all this can only be interpreted as attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR. Simultaneously the United States is working up tension in different regions of the world thus increasing international instability.

The Soviet side is firmly against any such encroachments. At the same time it is consistently working to establish a basis for a constructive dialogue with the USA. The Soviet Union is interested in straightening out Soviet-American relations and giving them a fresh impetus. In our opinion, Andrey Gromyko said, the key policy statement of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev of January 25, 1986, as well as his proposals made in Reykjavik constitute a good basis for such a dialogue.

During the conversation opinions were exchanged on principal issues of Soviet-American relations and on a wide range of international problems.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the USA and Canada Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences, was present at the meeting.

ALL-CHINA CONFERENCE VIEWS ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

PM021105 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 Jan 87 p 3

[TASS correspondent M. Abulkhatin dispatch: "Overcoming Shortcomings"]

[Text] Beijing -- Very close attention must be devoted this year to improving the production activities of industrial enterprises and enhancing their economic efficiency, Li Peng, vice premier of the PRC State Council, emphasized at an all-China conference on questions of economic work being held here.

According to him, enterprises' activities cannot be revived just on the basis of granting them preferential terms or reducing the size of taxes. It is necessary to improve the system of economic management, carry out the retooling of enterprises, and also "strengthen the creative activity of workers and employees and enhance leaders' personal responsibility."

The speakers at the conference named as one of the economy's chief tasks the improvement of product quality. It is planned to set up 200 state centers to monitor product quality in the PRC this year. They are to help activate production of high-quality goods. There is wide discussion of ways to overcome the shortcomings that exist in the Chinese economy, particularly in sectors such as power generation, transport and communications, and production of chemical fertilizers, plant protection agents, and diverse agricultural equipment.

The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO emphasizes that senior officials of the State Economic Commission and representatives of a number of ministries and departments, as well as of provinces, autonomous regions, and cities of central subordination, are participating in the work of the conference convened by the PRC State Council.

'Main Tasks' Outlined

PM031625 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Jan 87 p 3

[TASS report: "Main Tasks"]

[Text] Beijing, 27 Jan -- The implementation of reforms in enterprises, strict observance of a policy of thrift, the comprehensive raising of production efficiency, and the guaranteeing of stable and balanced development of the entire national economy -- such are the main tasks of the Chinese economy in the present year, it was said at the all-China conference on economic work which has ended in Beijing.

Lu Dong, chairman of the State Economic Commission, who spoke at the conference, indicated the paramount importance of measures to stimulate production in more than 7,000 large and medium-size enterprises which are the main performers of state production tasks and the sources of the state's financial revenue. In the process of reforming the economic system in industry, the implementation of different forms of economic responsibility, including the wide adoption of contracts, will continue. Their purpose is to regulate economic relations between the state and enterprises and between the enterprise and the workers, and also to aid the assimilation of new types of output and technical renovation, raising the activeness and creative initiative of all those engaged in production.

Small enterprises in public ownership which either make small profits or operate at a loss will introduce a lease or contract form of management. The right to enter into a contract or lease will be given both to collectives and individuals and to entire enterprises.

Participants at the meeting paid particular attention to a discussion of questions of raising the quality of output. This year, 200 quality control centers will be set up in China to this end.

LI PENG EXPRESSES 'CONFIDENCE' IN INTELLIGENTSIA

PM301515 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "China"]

[Text] Beijing -- Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the PRC State Council, declared during a meeting with a group of engineers that the party has complete confidence in the intelligentsia and that the party's policy toward it remains unchanged.

Li Peng emphasized that certain people are now trying to incite the intelligentsia to act against the party, even maintaining that members of the intelligentsia are the target of the struggle against "bourgeois liberalization." "That is pure slander and a distortion of reality," Li Peng pointed out.

SINOLOGISTS' ASSOCIATION HOLDS ROUTINE SESSION

PM051240 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Board Session"]

[Text] A routine session of the All-Union Association of Sinologists, which unites workers at scientific institutions, educational establishments, and practical organizations in the USSR, was held 3 February. Questions of the further development of Chinese studies in the Soviet Union, the popularization of knowledge about China, and the expansion of cooperation with the PRC in various spheres were discussed. M.L. Titarenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute, was elected chairman of the association.

FREIGHT CAR EXPORT CONTRACT SIGNED WITH PRC

LD051808 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Beijing February 5 TASS -- The all-union association Energomashexport today signed here a large contract with the Chinese company for the import and export of machinery and equipment to deliver freight cars to the PRC.

The signing of the contract means implementing one of important provisions for Soviet export to the PRC envisaged by the agreement between the governments of the USSR and the PRC on trade turnover and payments in 1986-1990.

7.5 thousand freight cars will be delivered to the PRC under the contract in 1987-1990.

The signing of the contract is an important stage in the development of trade between the two countries on a basis of mutual advantage.

DPRK LEADERS SEND MESSAGES TO GROMYKO, RYZHKOV

LD052356 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A telegram from Comrade Kim Il-song, president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which expresses gratitude for the greetings and good wishes on the occasion of his reelection as a president of the country, has arrived addressed to Comrade Gromyko.

In the telegram addressed to Comrade Ryzhkov, Comrade Yi Kun-mo, premier of the DPRK State Administrative Council, expresses gratitude for the greetings in connection with his reelection to this post.

DPRK ECONOMIC DELEGATION 9-DAY VISIT ENDS

LD052317 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- Matters concerning trade-and-economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) were discussed during the nine-day visit of the DPRK's government economic delegation to the Soviet Union. The delegation was led by Kim Pok-sin, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, vice premier of the Administration Council, chairman of the Foreign Economic Committee of the DPRK. The visit ended today.

During talks with Valdimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, chairman of the state Foreign Economic Commission of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the sides considered possibilities for more active utilization of new forms of cooperation: wider direct production-coordination contacts in the field of machine-building, the agri-industrial sector, the light industry, and other branches of the national economy, the establishment of joint enterprises, and the development of border trade on a mutually beneficial and balanced basis.

JAPAN'S PACIFIC 'MARSHALL PLAN' QUESTIONED

PM231229 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jan 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by A. Anichkin: "Japan's New Pacific Policy, or Tokyo's 'Marshall Plan'"]

[Text] Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari made a speech the other day in the capital of Fiji -- Suva -- setting out Tokyo's "Pacific doctrine." It sets forth the basic guidelines of Japanese foreign policy in the South Pacific. Long before the "doctrine" was announced the Japanese papers had dubbed it "Tokyo's Marshall Plan."

What did Kuranari promise for the Pacific Ocean, and why has neither Tokyo nor Washington needed such "doctrines" before? His vision of the "Pacific community of the future" -- this is what the foreign minister called his plan -- is based on joint prosperity. Tokyo is promising to provide abundant economic assistance to "strengthen political stability" and "promote the independence and self-sufficiency of the island states of the Pacific Ocean." Kuranari solemnly proclaimed that "Japan is using every opportunity to develop bilateral relations, and it will not encroach on independence or hinder any independent initiatives, no matter how small the partner might be." [paragraph continues]

Tokyo "supports and will promote all existing regional initiatives in the development of multilateral cooperation in the Pacific Ocean," and on no account will it "support the injection of tension into this region." Japan is sparing no effort to promote the development of friendly relations, links, and cooperation among the countries of the region, in particular between neighbors. Stressing that Japan's Pacific policy is a policy of peace, the minister, who comes from Nagasaki, Japan's second "atom city," solemnly stated: "The Pacific Ocean must remain an ocean of peace, as its very name suggests."

But why was his "doctrine" greeted in Australia and New Zealand with barely disguised apprehension? And why, when talking about promoting regional initiatives, did the Japanese minister not support the major joint act by the countries of the South Pacific region -- the conclusion and ratification of the Rarotonga treaty proclaiming the region a nuclear-free zone? Why did the Japanese journalists accompanying Kuranari on his tour of five Pacific countries constantly interpret their boss' pronouncements as a warning against "Soviet penetration"? And why did Walter Lini, prime minister of Vanuatu, have to make a special statement after his meeting with the Japanese minister to the effect that he did not share his concern about this mythical penetration?

The real purpose of the Kuranari "doctrine" is to consolidate the Pacific islands' status as the West's domain. The Japanese Government gave a hostile reception to the extensive program for peaceful, mutually advantageous cooperation and the creation of a lasting system of comprehensive security in the Asia-Pacific region which was set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech last July. What Tokyo saw primarily was a threat to its own interests, not the prospect of the Pacific becoming a zone of peace and prosperity. But the Soviet proposals made such a wide impact among the Pacific Ocean states that Japan felt it was necessary to come up with something to counter them. "Basically we found ourselves without our own strategy in the face of a vigorous Soviet peace offensive," the paper SANKEI SHIMBUN admitted. And Kuranari's trip was an attempt to counter the USSR's Pacific program with his own "doctrine."

Hence the patent attempts to discredit Soviet policy in the Pacific in the Japanese press, with anonymous "military experts" continuing to use the local press as a medium for frightening Japanese by talking about Soviet plans to "patrol the southern part of the Pacific Ocean with nuclear submarines carrying ballistic missiles" and even to set up a "permanent base" for them somewhere in Fiji or Vanuatu.

The USSR's steps to establish mutually advantageous trade and economic relations with the region's island states provoke in Tokyo almost hysterical calls for efforts to block the "Soviet advance." The focus of Tokyo's current "anxiety" is Vanuatu -- a republic with a total area of around 12,000 square km and a population of 120,000. The Japanese minister plugged the Tokyo-style "concern" during his talks in Australia and New Zealand, but he did not encounter particular enthusiasm. Australia and New Zealand advocate the idea of "Pacific Ocean economic detente," and they treated the Soviet Union's Vladivostok proposals seriously.

Tokyo's efforts to prevent the Soviet Union from participating in the process of developing and strengthening Pacific cooperation are distrusted in Japan itself.

"Military-political aspects must not be allowed to come to the fore, because this would ultimately undermine Japan's relations with the developing countries, and we must ensure that the U.S. line is not imposed on the Pacific Ocean states," N. Goto, president of the Japanese Chamber of Trade and Industry, said in a recent interview.

The concern about the "U.S. line" is no accident. According to the press, the United States made a confidential request to Japan last summer to step up economic influence on the Pacific countries. Washington's plan is that credit and loans from Tokyo will put a damper on the growth of the antinuclear and antiwar mood in the region, which is strewn with major U.S. strategic bases. New Zealand's policy of prohibiting calls by nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear weapons, the similar stance adopted by a number of other countries in the South Pacific and, finally, the entry into force of the Rarotonga treaty -- these are the causes of the concern felt by Washington and its loyal ally, Tokyo, which turns a blind eye to the ever-increasing use of the Japanese islands in U.S. nuclear strategy.

Isn't it the Pacific Ocean states' desire for peace and cooperation for future generations that Kuranari's "Pacific doctrine" is trying to prevent?

USSR-JAPAN FISHERIES COMMISSION SESSION OPENS

LD021813 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 2 TASS -- Questions connected with the development of cooperation between the USSR and Japan in scientific research into the sea fauna, as well as the protection, reproduction and rational use of fish resources in the north-western part of the Pacific are being discussed at the third session of the bilateral commission for the fishing industry that opened here today. It was set up in accordance with the Soviet-Japanese intergovernmental agreement of May 12, 1985, which expires late in the current year.

Speaking at the opening of the session, heads of the delegation pointed out that positive changes had been taking place of late in the development of ties between fishermen of the two countries: agreements were reached on a mutually acceptable basis of reciprocal fishing in the economic zones of the countries, and all the claims connected with fishing were settled.

Vyacheslav Zilanov, head of the external relations department of the USSR Ministry of Fisheries, who is heading the Soviet delegation, said that the Soviet side was attaching much importance to the joint study of sea resources in the north-western part of the Pacific, because it is to promote on a long-term basis the ensuring of a stable catch for fishermen. The cooperation of organizations and firms of the two countries in the sphere of fishing technology, the processing and artificial reproduction of sea products seems to be rather promising.

The protection of salmon reproducing in rivers of the USSR is also an important item of the agenda. Despite the measures approved by the previous sessions of the commission, some salmon shoals remain in a state of repression as a result of continuing fishing. Vyacheslav Zilanov urged to analyze new forms of cooperation on the rational use of the salmon.

BRIEFS

DPRK YOUTH DELEGATION -- A delegation composed of a number of members from the League of Socialist Working Youth of Korea has visited Azerbaijan SSR. The DPRK delegation is currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee. The guests were received by Sahib Alekperov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan SSR Komsomol Central Committee, and Ramiz Mekhtiyev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. [Summary] [Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 3 Feb 87 NC]

PAKISTANI FOREIGN MINISTER ARRIVES IN MOSCOW

LD051524 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- Pakistan's Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yaqub Khan arrived in Moscow today as guest of the Soviet Government.

He was welcomed at the airport by Boris Chaplin, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, and other officials.

DRA-PAKISTAN TALKS POSTPONED TILL 25 FEB

LD022154 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Kabul February 2 TASS -- A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan told BAKHTAR news agency that the Afghan-Pakistani talks, scheduled to be held in Geneva on February 11, were postponed till February 25 at the request of the personal representative of the U.N. secretary-general, Diego Cordovez, in connection with the need to hold additional consultations.

KATUSHEV MEETS DRA BUSINESS DELEGATION HEAD

LD052252 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- A meeting between chairman of the USSR State Committee for External Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev and Minister of Finance and Economics of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistn Fazel Haq Halequar [name as received] was held here today. Fazel Haq Halequar heads a delegation of the Afghan business circles at the talks in Moscow. Questions of the participation of private Afghan firms in the development of mutually advantageous economic cooperation between the USSR and the DRA were discussed.

It was noted during the conversation that there are broad opportunities for the development of economic ties between Soviet organisations and private Afghan firms in the construction in the DRA of facilities for the light and food industries, the tanning industry and other branches. Forms and terms of such cooperation were also discussed.

BRIEFS

INDIAN INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION -- New Delhi January 29 TASS -- The Soviet-Indian Working Group on Industrial Cooperation and Machine-Building, set up within the framework of the intergovernmental commission for economic, scientific and technological cooperation, has closed its second session in the Indian capital. The sides agreed upon specific prospects for broadening mutually beneficial ties in this field in realizing the accords signed during Mikhail Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India. Special attention will be given to developing long-term cooperation with Indian state-sector enterprises, including the heavy machine-making plants in Ranchi and Durgapur that were built with Soviet assistance. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 29 Jan 87 LD]

PRAVDA REPORTS SHEVARDNADZE'S TALKS IN GDR

PM051042 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the general heading "On E.A. Shevardnadze's Visit to the GDR"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, was in the GDR on an official friendly visit 2-4 February 1987 at the invitation of the GDR Government.

E.A. Shevardnadze was received by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and had a friendly talk with him. Questions of bilateral cooperation and the development of the international situation were discussed. E. Honecker spoke of the SED's work to implement the decisions of the 11th party congress and of the great achievements of the GDR working people in socialist competition. The USSR foreign minister gave a detailed briefing on the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, which was devoted to questions of restructuring and party cadre policy.

A meeting also took place with W. Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

E.A. Shevardnadze and GDR Foreign Minister O. Fischer had a detailed exchange of opinions on questions of the further development of bilateral relations and topical international problems. The beneficial influence of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 11th SED Congress on all spheres of USSR-GDR cooperation was noted with satisfaction. The great significance of meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and E. Honecker for the progressive development of the entire range of relations between the two countries was stressed. On the basis of the total identity of views on all fundamental questions of the theory and practice of socialist building, the USSR and the GDR intend to deepen their close cooperation based on trust and systematically to exchange experience in this sphere. The joint celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution will be a convincing confirmation of the unity, cohesion, and indissoluble fraternal friendship of our peoples.

In the course of the exchange of opinions on questions of the international situation, emphasis was placed on the profound influence of the large-scale program for the reduction and elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction and the substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional arms on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security and under effective verification, set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 Statement, the Soviet proposals in Reykjavik, and the appeal of the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee.

The participants in the talks expressed the hope that the U.S. Administration, in its approach to concrete accords on nuclear arms reduction and on preventing the militarization of space, will be guided by joint responsibility for preserving peace and also by the prospects which opened up in Reykjavik.

In this connection the need for strict compliance with and strengthening of the ABM Treaty was stressed.

It was the unanimous opinion that the implementation of the 41st UN General Assembly session resolution, adopted on the socialist countries' initiative and concerning the creation of an all-embracing system of peace and international security, is an urgent task.

The GDR side expressed full support for the Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world and on the need for new political thinking in the nuclear and space age.

During the discussion of the situation in Europe, attention was drawn to the joint initiatives of the Warsaw Pact states, which created the preconditions for major steps to lessen military confrontation on the continent. The package of proposals on nuclear and space arms put forward by the Soviet Union opens up real opportunities for the elimination of American and Soviet medium-range missiles on the European continent. In the event of the elimination of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the grounds for the continued presence of Soviet increased-range operational-tactical missiles in the GDR and the CSSR will disappear.

The Soviet side resolutely supports the initiatives put forward by the GDR and the CSSR on creating a nuclear-free corridor and a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe. Their implementation would be a substantial contribution to the strengthening of peace and security.

The ministers came out in favor of proceeding with the all-European process in all avenues, of adopting at the Vienna meeting of CSCE states a decision on adding disarmament questions to the mandate of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, and of widening cooperation in the economic, humanitarian, and other spheres.

The significance again was stressed of the socialist countries' treaties with the FRG, as well as the four-power agreement on West Berlin, which enshrine the immutability of the territorial and political realities of modern Europe and which form the basis for the establishment and development of constructive cooperation. The sides expressed the hope that the federal government will be guided consistently by the spirit and letter of these treaties, will display political intelligence, and will refrain from actions detrimental to the development of relations with the socialist countries and to the interests of peace and security in Europe.

Discussing questions relating to the situation in the Near East, southern Africa, and Central America, the ministers expressed solidarity with peoples struggling against imperialism, racism, and neocolonialism. They condemned the imperialist policy of neoglobalism, diktat, and aggression, and stressed the right of every people freely and with no outside interference to choose its path of political, economic, and social development.

The sides stated their readiness to strengthen the defensive alliance of the Warsaw Pact states and promote in every way the deepening of collaboration among the socialist community countries in international affairs and in the elaboration and implementation of a coordinated foreign policy course aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear war and ensuring universal peace.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding, and total identity of views on all the questions discussed. On behalf of the Soviet Government, E.A. Shevardnadze conveyed to O. Fischer an invitation to pay an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with thanks.

REPORTAGE ON SHEVARDNADZE'S OFFICIAL CSSR VISIT

Met at Airport by Chnoupek

LD040926 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 4 Feb 87

[Text] Prague February 4 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR minister of foreign affairs, today arrived in Prague on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the government of Czechoslovakia.

He was met at the airport by Bohuslav Chnoupek, Czechoslovakia's foreign affairs minister, and other officials. The USSR ambassador to Czechoslovakia, Viktor Lomakin, was among the welcoming party.

Holds Talks with Chnoupek

LD041825 Moscow International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 4 Feb 87

[Text] Prague, 4 Feb (TASS) -- Talks took place today in Prague between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR foreign minister.

E. Shevardnadze briefed B. Chnoupek on the process of restructuring that has developed in all spheres of the life of Soviet society since the 27th CPSU Congress. Describing the January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on questions of restructuring and party's cadre policy as an event of special importance, he stressed that the decisions adopted by it will have a deep inluence on the implmentation of the strategic course worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress.

In the course of the negotiations, a high assessment was given to the level of development of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, and the desire of the two sides to strive energetically for the further deepening and improvement of the multifaceted cooperation between the two countries was expressed.

During an exchange of views on a broad range of international problems, the two sides confirmed their determination to do everything possible to solve the main contemporary task: the liberation of the world from nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the century. In this regard, they noted the particular topicality of M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986 and the importance of increasing efforts to implement the proposals contained in it. They stressed the urgent need to activate the struggle for the establishment of an all-embracing system of international security.

In the discussion of questions of security and cooperation on the European continent, support was expressed from the Soviet side for the initiative proposed by the CSSR and the GDR for creating in Central Europe a nuclear-free corridor and a zone free of chemical weapons and for the CSSR proposal for conducting an economic forum by the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The talks passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere, and once again affirmed the complete unity of views on all the questions discussed.

A joint discussion was adopted on the results of the talks, which will be published in the press.

On the same day B. Chnoupek gave a dinner in honor of E.A. Shevardnadze.

E.A. Shevardnadze visited the national memorial on Zizka Hill where he laid a wreath and flowers at the tomb of the unknown soldier, at the monument to K. Gottwald, and in the Hall of the Soviet Army. A wreath was also laid at the monument to Soviet servicemen at Olsany Cemetery.

E.A. Shevardnadze spoke at a meeting of the aktiv of the party organization of Soviet foreign institutions in Czechoslovakia devoted to the results of the January 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. He stressed the vast importance of its decisions for the implementation of the strategic course of the 27th Congress aimed at accelerating the country's social and economic development. Note was made of the unanimous support given by the Soviet people for the restructuring policy. In the speech, particular attention was paid to questions of the further strengthening of the cooperation among the fraternal countries and of raising the efficacy of all-round Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

'Cordial' Meeting With Husak

LD051727 Moscow International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Prague, 5 Feb (TASS) -- Profound satisfaction over the fruitful development of relations between the USSR and the CSSR, which is based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, was expressed today at a meeting in Prague between Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, president of the CSSR, and Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is in the CSSR on an official friendly visit.

Eduard Shevardnadze conveyed to Gustav Husak heartfelt greetings and good wishes from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. For his part, Gustav Husak asked for warm greetings and best wishes to be conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev and to other Soviet leaders. Profound satisfaction was expressed over the fruitful development of relations between th USSR and the CSSR, which are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

The CSSR leader described the achievements of the Czechoslovak people on the road to building socialism and in the course of implementing the decisions of the 17th CPCZ Congress. The invariability of the CPCZ strategic line of continuing close cooperation with the Soviet Unionin all areas was emphasized.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, Eduard Shevardnadze wished the Communists and all working people of Czechoslovakia great success in fulfilling large-scale plans for speeding up the CSSR's socioeconomic development.

He briefed Gustav Husak on the course of the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the main results of the fulfillment of the state plan for social and economic development of the Soviet Union last year, and the restructuring that is taking place in various areas of public life.

The special importance of the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, at which the question of restructuring and of the party cadres policy was examined with Leninist adherence to principle, in wide sociopolitical context, and with consideration for the lessons of the past and the nature of the present, for the party, and for the entire country was emphasized.

During the exchange of views on international questions, they expressed the necessity -- under conditions of the complex and tense international situation -- for the further strengthening of the unity and cohesion of countries of the socialist community and the stepping up of their joint efforts in the struggle against the nuclear threat to mankind. In this regard, it was stressed that the complex of Soviet foreign policy initiatives, contained in the statement of Mikhail Gorbachev from 15 January 1986, and other proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries, are a constructive platform for the effective struggle for strengthening international peace and security.

The sides condemned the U.S. Administration's destructive course toward the worsening of international tension and toward diluting the mutual understanding on major disarmament questions reached in Reykjavik. It was noted that the new nuclear blast carried out a few days ago by the United States is a challenge to all mankind; seriously complicating the international situation.

During the meeting, the importance of giving material form, in the practice of international relations, to the new thinking that is taking hold in the minds of men was expressed.

The conversation was conducted in a cordial atmosphere and an atmosphere of full mutual understanding.

Discusses Ties With Strougal

LD051718 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Prague, 5 Feb (TASS) -- Lubomir Strougal, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR Government, met in Prague today with Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs.

Eduard Shevardnadze talked about the great work of Communists and all Soviet working people directed at fulfilling the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and about the restructuring process in all spheres of life of society. Emphasis was placed on the special significance for the further progressive development of the Soviet Union of the January (1987) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which confirmed once again the objective necessity for changes that are revolutionary in nature, for deepening socialist democracy, and for perfecting cadres policy under the new conditions.

During the conversation, a high evaluation was given to multifaceted Soviet-Czechoslovakian cooperation and the need to raise its effectiveness was stressed. In this regard, note was taken of the prime importance of the consistent implementation of the program of long-term economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and CSSR for the period up to the year 2000 and the development of new forms of it: direct production links, the creation of joint enterprises and collectives.

The conviction was expressed that strengthening bilateral ties will facilitate the successful solution of tasks of accelerating the socioeconomic development of both countries and raising the prosperity of their peoples.

During the exchange of views on key problems of the contemporary international situation, it was stressed that a realistic alternative to the arms race policy is the peace initiatives of the USSR and other socialist countries directed at freeing mankind of the nuclear threat and creating a universal system of international security. They pointed to the importance of an all-round stepping up of the activity of the all-European process and improving the political climate in Europe.

The conversation passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

CTK: Interview Published

LD060942 Prague CTK in English 0844 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Prague Feb 6 (CTK) -- Innovative proposals and the bold actions of the fraternal socialist countries in all directions, including questions of control, settlement of regional conflicts and social humanitarian cooperation, widen the roads leading to the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security, Eduard Shevardnadze said in an interview for RUDE PRAVO published today.

The Soviet foreign minister said at the conclusion of his two-day visit to Czechoslovakia that the Soviet Union wants the Soviet-American dialogue to be constructive and wishes that every effort is made so that the historic "window" of possibilities half-opened in Reykjavik may not be slammed.

It has so far been hardly possible to point to some hopeful aspects in the stand of the U.S. Administration. Rather on the contrary. Concepts of policy from the position of strength, confirmed by the President in his State of the Union message, new financial sources for the program of nuclear rearmament and space militarization of the USA as well as the continuing U.S. withdrawal from fundamental Soviet-American agreements -- all this gives no reason for optimism. Hopes are naturally undermined by the latest nuclear explosion carried out by the USA these days. It constitutes another overt challenge to mankind; it is an act of disregard for its fundamental interests, the Soviet foreign minister stressed.

Eduard Shevardnadze went on to say that the Soviet Union does not cease to seek a road towards agreement. "We would not like to believe that the present U.S. Administration has taken the final choice and that it is ready to allow the failure of the whole perspective of an agreement with the Soviet Union and to permit that the remaining two years be wasted on the same dangerous rush for the vision of military superiority. In principle we have not lost hope for the successful culmination of the Reykjavik talks with the present leading U.S. representatives. I believe that it is also in their interest to get to the end of the term of office of the present President with a good score," he said.

He further highly appreciated and supported the initiative of three political parties -- the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the SPD and the Czechoslovak Communist Party -- to create a nuclear-free zone in central Europe and a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe.

He said that the Soviet Union considers the very fact that political parties of three European states standing on different sides of the military dividing line cooperate a new positive feature, a new aspect in the practice of international relations. The implementation of this proposal would undoubtedly improve political climate in Europe, he added.

The Soviet foreign minister further stressed that Europe needs the largest possible area free of dangerous weapons. Attention and support should therefore be given to the proposals that zones free of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction be established in Europe, especially in its central and northern part and in the Balkans.

Speaking of measures aimed at disarmament in Europe, the Soviet foreign minister said that the Soviet Union is of the opinion that the most suitable forum for talks on all questions concerning conventional weapons in Europe and also the mandate of these talks is the Vienna meeting of representatives of states taking part in the all-European process.

He also expressed the Soviet view that it would be effective to hold consultations with the NATO countries. Bilateral and multilateral contacts not only between the states of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO but also with neutral and nonaligned countries could contribute to mutual understanding.

He also said that the stands which are often expressed in the West that the question of medium-range missiles should be taken out from the Reykjavik "package" are irresponsible. "The problem of the Reykjavik package contains response to the question whether to agree with space militarization. To liquidate the only obstacle to space weapons -- the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty? Our answer is explicitly no. It is a matter of principle, honour and conscience," the Soviet Foreign Minister said.

Joint Communique Issued

LD051858 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 5 Feb 87

["Joint Soviet-Czechoslovak Communique," issued on 5 February -- read by announcer]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, was on an official friendly visit to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on 4 and 5 February 1987 as the guest of the CSSR Government.

Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR, received Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. There was also a conversation with Lubomir Strougal, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR Council of Ministers.

The Czechoslovak leaders were informed about the results of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee plenum which will occupy a special place in the struggle to implement the political and socioeconomic strategy worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress.

From the Czechoslovak side it was stressed that the Communists and citizens of Czechoslovakia have acquainted themselves in detail with the results of the plenum. They follow with great interest the restructuring taking place in all spheres of life of Soviet society and totally support it.

Comrade Shevardnadze was given detailed information about the fulfillment of the decisions of the Fourth CPCZ Central Committee plenum which was an important stimulus for the Czechoslovak working people to mobilize all forces to implement the strategic line of the 17th CPCZ Congress.

Comrade Shevardnadze and Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and foreign minister of the CSSR, exchanged opinions on the further expansion and deepening of all-round links between the USSR and the CSSR in the spirit of the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 17th CPCZ Congress.

During the talks, stress was laid on the landmark importance of the working meeting in Moscow of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the CEMA member countries. It was noted that it gave a new impulse to the work to raise the efficiency of cooperation among the socialist states in all spheres, to fuller use the creative potential of socialism and to further step up their joint efforts in the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons and to reduce conventional ones, and to strengthen peace and international security.

Confidence was expressed that the implementation of the integrated program of scientific-technical progress of the CEMA member countries and the program for long-term economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and the CSSR for the period to the year 2000 will raise economic relations between the two countries to qualitatively higher levels. The introduction of new forms of cooperation, the establishment of direct links between industrial enterprises, the setting up of joint scientific and design collelctives, enterprises, and associations ensures favorable conditions for raising the efficiency of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic cooperation.

The talks confirmed the total unanimity of views in assessing the current international situation and the reasons for the dangerous tension in the world. The nuclear threat hanging over mankind is a direct result of the imperialist policy of the United States and of the NATO military bloc. Concern was expressed at the actions of the United States, which is eroding earlier-reached agreements limiting the nuclear armaments race [words indistinct] strategic stability, leading toward taking weapons into space. This is clearly shown by the U.S. renunciation of the SALT II treaty.

The sides stated that the past year has clearly shown the vitality and realism of the program for the elimination by the end of this century of nuclear and other types of weapons as set out in the statement of 15 January 1986 by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which received broad international support. The constructive proposals based on a careful balance of interests and mutual concessions that were put forward by the USSR in Reykjavik raised the struggle for a nuclear weapon-free world to a qualitatively new level.

The U.S. plans for Star Wars continue to remain the main obstacle to achieving an accord leading mankind to eliminating the threat of a universal nuclear catastrophe. The real possibility of creating effective barriers in the way of the nuclear arms race was shown by the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions that the USSR has implemented for 1 and 1/2 years. Whether this is to be turned into a bilateral one depends entirely on the United States.

The sides are fully resolved to step up efforts in the struggle for the reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear arsenals for the sake of the survival of mankind. With this aim, they will develop dialogue and expand cooperation with other states and with all peace-loving forces.

It was stressed that the complex of Soviet proposals on nuclear and space weapons opens up a realistic path for eliminating U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. If the U.S. missiles of this type in Europe are eliminated, there will be no grounds for the further stay [prebyvaniye] of Soviet enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles in the CSSR and GDR.

The ministers discussed further steps with regard to the implementation of the joint initiative of the socialist countries for the creation of a universal system of international peace and security approved by the 41st session of the UN General Assembly. They paid particular attention to the situation in Europe and to efforts to improve the atmosphere on the continent. Stress was laid on the fact that the proposals put forward in Budapest by the Warsaw Pact member-states open up prospects for an integrated and in-depth reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Readiness was expressed for immediate discussion, within the framework of the European process, of practical measures to implement this proposal.

Standing for the deepening of cooperation between European states in all fields, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will make every effort to ensure that the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is conducted in a constructive spirit and ends with positive results.

The Soviet side declared support for the CSSR's porposal concerning the holding of an economic forum of states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Czechoslovak side expressed support for the Soviet Union's proposal to convene a conference on humanitarian questions in Moscow.

The ministers consider that the inviolability of frontiers and respect for the territorial and political realities that took shape as a result of World War II and postwar developments constitute the essential condition for the maintenance of lasting peace in Europe. The activities of revanchist forces, primarily in the FRG, and their hostile attacks against the socialist countries poison the political atmosphere and inflict damage on the cause of strengthening trust and good-neighborly relations.

Expressing concern over the heightening of tension in a number of regions of the world, the ministers stressed the urgent need for an early settlement of conflict situations in a peaceful way, taking into account the legitimate rights of all peoples to free and independent development.

Support was expressed for the policy of the DRA leadership geared toward the political resolution of the situation surrounding Afghanistan and the attainment of national reconciliation in the country.

The sides stated that the close interaction of the countries of the socialist community in putting into effect a coordinated policy in international affairs and the further consolidation of the Warsaw Pact are important factors in ensuring peaceful conditions for the construction of socialism.

The talks proceeded in the traditional atmosphere of fraternal friendship and cordiality and complete unanimity of opinions on all issues discussed.

On behalf of the USSR Government, Comrade Shevardnadze handed an invitation to Bohuslav Chnoupek to pay an official and friendly visit to the Soviet Union.

The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Airport Send-off by Chnoupek

LD051712 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Prague February 5 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze left Prague today on the completion of his official friendly visit.

He was seen off at the airport by Bohuslav Chnoupek and other officials.

Returns, Met by Chebrikov

LD051935 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, returned to Moscow today. He stayed in the GDR and Czechoslovakia on official friendly visits. Viktor Chebrikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, and other officials welcomed Eduard Shevardnadze at the airport in Moscow.

Further Reports on Trip

For additional reportage on Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Prague, see the Czechoslovakia section of the 5 February Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

TALYZIN, ANTONOV MEET BULGARIAN DELEGATION

PM051048 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Soviet-Bulgarian Working Meetings"]

[Text] The Soviet-Bulgarian working meetings envisaged under the program for the official friendly visit to the USSR by G. Atanasov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, began in Moscow 3 February.

Taking part are: on the Soviet side -- N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan; A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; B.I. Aristov, minister of foreign trade; K.F. Katushev, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; V.P. Loginov, USSR deputy foreign minister; L.I. Grekov, USSR ambassador to Bulgaria; and O.K. Rybakov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee section; on the Bulgarian side -- Kiril Zarev, member of the BCP Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers; Khristo Khristov, member of the BCP Central Committee and minister of trade; Georgi Pankov, member of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR; Mariy Ivanov, member of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian first deputy foreign minister; and Krustyu Stanilov, member of the BCP Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers Economic Council.

Questions of implementing accords on the development of new forms of mutual Soviet-Bulgarian production, scientific, and technical cooperation aimed at fulfilling the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries Through the Year 2000 were discussed, as well as certain aspects of economic cooperation and the further expansion of trade turnover between the USSR and Bulgaria.

The meetings are taking place in a friendly, businesslike atmosphere.

RYABOV-LED CPSU DELEGATION VISITS HUNGARY

PM031413 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the MSZMP, a group of CPSU party workers headed by V.V. Ryabov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Establishments Section, was in Hungary 26 through 30 January to familiarize itself with the experience of the MSZMP's work in organizing research in the sphere of the social sciences and their teaching in the country's VUZ's.

The group was received by L. Pal, secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee.

HUNGARIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIAL HORN VISITS

LD041228 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1053 GMT 4 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 4 February (TASS) -- All that goes on in the Soviet Union interests us in Hungary. We believe that the processes which have been unfolding in the Soviet Union over the last year and a half give great grounds for hope, said Gyula Horn, state secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, speaking today in the USSR ministry of Foreign Affairs press center. He has come to the Soviet Union on a working visit to conduct regular consultations.

He emphasized the importance and significance of the latest plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU and noted that such important issues as the formulation of economic and political reforms and the cadre problem, without the solution of which any renewal of the economy is impossible, were at the center of the participants' attention. One can see the qualitatively new processes, said Gyula Horn, and these have attracted serious attention in the world.

At the present consultation in Moscow, he said we have been discussing questions concerning the talks in Vienna and Geneva, advances in setting up a comprehensive security system, an assessment of U.S. policies, and economic relations between East and West. Such consultations help speed up the development of constructive approaches to solving problems. In the last year and a half the system of consultations between the socialist countries has strengthened considerably, Gyula Horn pointed out.

Answering a question about the effect of yesterday's U.S. nuclear explosion in Nevada on international relations, the general secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic said that such a step by the United States would complicate relations and make it more difficult to find a solution to the problems of a moratorium on nuclear tests and a ban on nuclear weapons.

Gyula Horn, state secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Hungary, leaves for home today.

Confers With Petrovskiy

PM041443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Consultation at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs"]

[Text] Consultations have been held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs between V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, and G. Horn, state secretary of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. There was a detailed exchange of opinions on certain issues of mutual interest concerning international relations.

U.S., UK AGREE ON CYPRUS 'ESPIONAGE STATIONS'

PM051209 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[Own Information-TASS report under the "Foreign Military News" rubric: "Secret Agreement"]

[Text] The Cypriot newspaper TA NEA reports that the implementation of a secret agreement between U.S. President R. Reagan and British Prime Minister M. Thatcher has begun. It concerns the activity of British military bases on Cyprus and provides for their transformation into powerful permanent radioelectronic espionage stations in the Eastern Mediterranean. In addition, it envisages the permanent stationing at the base in Akrotiri of Air Force strike subunits capable of attacking targets in the region from Lybia to Syria. The United States is sending the latest electronic equipment to the British bases to service those subunits.

SUPREME SOVIET GROUP VISITS GREAT BRITAIN

LD042352 Moscow TASS in English 2318 GMT 4 Feb 87

[Text] London February 5 TASS -- The delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet currently staying in London paid a visit to the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office and talked with T. Eggar, the parliamentary deputy of the foreign secretary. Later in the day, Vadim Zagladin, who heads the Soviet delegation, met with Britain's Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe. The conversations centered on topical international issues of mutual interest and questions pertaining to the development of Soviet-British relations.

Zagladin Comments on Visit

LD040151 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] A delegation from the Foreign Affairs Committee of both houses of the Soviet national parliament has been paying a visit to Britain at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons. In an interview to Radio Moscow Vadim Zagladin, who leads the delegation, has had this to say:

[Begin Zagladin recording in Russian fading to English translation] Our delegation arrived in London to return the visit of a delegation from the Foreign Affairs Commission of the British Parliament. We must say it was not the first step. The first one in a new direction after a period of notable alienation, was taken in the late '84, when Mikhail Gorbachev led a delegation from the national parliament to Britain. There have been some new developments since then. We don't believe it's either final or completed. On the contrary it has been in progress. More ways for a dialogue and more possibilities for promoting ties among nations have been found. We have been discussing the key problems of the international situation, including Soviet-British relations understandably, and how the two countries see the major issues of the world situation today.

We could see from the great many questions that were asked that many Britons had been closely following the situation in the Soviet Union, that they knew the principle ideas expressed by our leadership, and that they showed interest in gearing all this to promoting Anglo-Soviet relations. It was a great pleasure to state it. With pleasure, too, we answered all the questions in detail, pointing out that better understanding seemed a key issue of the present stage of our two countries' development.

So, we have a dialogue. But it is essential to move to concrete actions. And we want to know how British MPs imagined this transition and what place Britain could, and wished, to take in the nuclear disarmament process; the disarmament process in general and also the process of moving towards a nuclear-free and safer world. No questions, even the acute and complicated ones, were overlooked. Both sides said they believed that to hush up some problem means to miss the chance of solving it. We discussed all sorts of problems, trying to find some mutually acceptable positions.

The question of human rights too was raised. Only we must say this time it was discussed from a somewhat different angle. First because the very human right to live has been questioned and jeopardized and second because the mutual understanding that is needed requires mutual understanding on this question as well. At this angle of view we discussed the existing problems, bearing in mind that we must move ahead but must not claim any monopoly on the truth. Instead of accusing one another it is essential to discuss problems and look for the same view that could help lift distrust and promote confidence. We can say the first few discussions we have had were positive and the atmosphere was friendly, cordial, and constructive. This gives us hope our further discussions will help improve our relations irrespective of the turn that the international situation may take. Britain and the Soviet Union have the right to be partners no matter what position the other powers will hold. [end recording]

UK PAPER 'TODAY' CITED ON SECRET SPY SATELLITE

PM041444 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Within the Framework of the Trident Program"]

[Text] London, 2 Feb -- There are serious grounds to suggest that the British Government's secret plans to create a satellite for espionage against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are directly linked to the implementation of the Trident program, the TODAY newspaper writes.

Specialists believe this satellite is capable of functioning as an autonomous control system for targeting Trident missiles, which the Conservative government intends to deploy on submarines. The newspaper notes that in the event of a nuclear conflict the British satellite could be included with analogous American systems.

The suggested link with the Trident program largely explains why Margaret Thatcher's government is now searching so feverishly for materials relating to a film on the spy satellite. The film was made by journalist Duncan Campbell, but its showing on television was banned by the BBC leadership. The government hastened to ban its viewing even by parliamentarians. British special service agents spent more than 24 hours searching the premises of the BBC Glasgow department, where the film was made. They confiscated more than 200 reels of film and several boxes of documents. [paragraph continues]

Earlier the police searched Campbell's apartment, as well as the editorial offices of the weekly NEW STATESMAN, which published an article on the illegal actions of the Tory government in drawing up the plan to create the spy satellite in secrecy from parliament.

U.S. INTELLIGENCE RUNS 'FREE HAND' IN UK

LD030010 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] [Announcer] Nikolay Borin now looks at the recent police search of the BBC's Glasgow Office. The BBC search is only the latest in a series of similar searches at the NEW STATESMAN office and the homes of three journalists, including Duncan Campbell. Campbell's film on a British spy satellite project was the pretext. The project provides for launching a satellite to eavesdrop on radio communications in the Soviet Union, Europe, and the Middle East.

Now what is behind this clampdown on press freedom, given the government's official stand in support of the freedom of the press, or at any rate, lip service to it? The question is answered by Nikolay Borin.

[Borin] The media have learned that the functions of the future satellite fit into the overall picture of the Pentagon's intelligence interests and that has clearly added new aspects to the issue. Some observers, moreover, suggest that the present toughness of Mrs Thatcher's government should be viewed in the context of Tories' election campaign and that the party wants to show its firmness. But I don't think that is the point. It is more likely the government was faced with another disclosure of a dangerous deal with Washington to the detriment of national interests. It is this that triggered the punitive actions against Campbell, the NEW STATESMAN, and now the BBC.

It takes a mere look at the vast region to be covered by the spy satellite to realize that its mission is quite in line with Washington's neoglobalist ambitions. And that might explain the government's stubborn reluctance to inform parliament about a project that is now an open secret to journalists.

[Announcer] But can you cite any evidence to support your claim that American interests are behind the government's action in the current secrecy drive?

[Borin] I would mention only the latest in a series of facts. Not so long ago the Cheltenham communications center was in the news when the government threatened to carry out mass sackings among its staff if they did not give up their union membership. According to the newspaper TODAY, it is from Cheltenham that data on British security risks are transmitted to the United States for storage at the National Security Agency computer at Fort Meade, Maryland. Conservative MP Robert Key tried to find out on what grounds American intelligence was collecting such data on British subjects, so he, too, was added to the list of security risks. That demonstrates once again that the United States intelligence has a free hand in the United Kingdom and that the British Government is obediently using its repressive machine to serve American interests.

UK GOVERNMENT STANCE ON ARMS CURBS EXAMINED

PM031449 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov "Letter from London": "Runup to Election Year"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted assessing the Conservative Government's record since 1979 and the opposition parties' likely election programs]

Many people in Britain are disappointed at the Conservative government's attitude to the problem of nuclear disarmament in the year of great hope engendered by M.S. Gorbachev's Statement of 15 January 1986. At the very time that the Soviet test ranges were falling silent British and U.S. nuclear munitions were being detonated in far-off Nevada and M. Thatcher was openly saying that she did not imagine a world without nuclear weapons.

That was not simply an expression of the prime minister's personal opinion, it was also a gamble that some voters believe that Britain's own "deterrent forces" (costly and ultimately useless, in the opinion of others) do nevertheless ensure the country's position as a great world power, a matter which by tradition is particularly sensitive to quite a few British people.

Tory Britain was the first of the NATO states to agree to take part in work on the SDI program, which presumably reflected not just the desire for large profits from General Abrahamson's orders but also certain political and military-strategic concepts.

They include crude attacks on the Soviet Union, various maneuvers to perfect "defenses against a Soviet invasion," and outright attempts at interference in our country's internal affairs. This is also part of the Conservatives' election campaign. However, such political measures can hardly help strengthen international confidence. Possibly quite the reverse.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that M. Thatcher cannot fail to realize that London's one-sided orientation toward the Reagan administration has shown signs of strain. Like it or not, she will have to prove during the election campaign that the Conservative government knows how to defend its own interests, take account of its Western European partners' collective interests, and offer something in the disarmament sphere. It is common knowledge that Britain has already put forward some practical measures here, notably with regard to chemical weapons. Other measures are surely possible, too.

However, the position taken by some Western European leaders, including in Britain, since Reykjavik can only cause bewilderment. It only took the appearance of a move toward nuclear disarmament to frighten London to death. It tries to replace radical moves in this sphere with certain "priorities," based on measures taken from our package of proposals and linked to the artificial problems of verification and confidence, and almost with the changing of the political system in the USSR. Clearly, the Reykjavik "package" -- that balance of concessions and interdependent interests -- is not to everyone's liking in the British Isles.

...It is hard to predict whether this will be election year for the United Kingdom and, if so, who will win. But what is certain is that Britain, which is expected to play a more responsible and constructive role in the world arena, faces a global choice: either to promote or to hinder nuclear disarmament, without which there can be no peaceful or confident future for any of the world's peoples.

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON U.S.-SPAIN TROOP CUT TALKS

LD041350 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2200 GMT 3 Feb 87

[Text] A new round of the Spanish-U.S. negotiations on the reduction of the U.S. Military presence in Spain has begun in Madrid. Our observer Yuriy Konstantinov writes:

As is well known, the three previous rounds ended with no results. The only agreed upon by the two sides last December was to hold another meeting at the level of experts at the beginning of February. As we see, the rules of the negotiations are being observed. What are the positions and the prospects of the sides in the new round?

Judging everything, the United States is not prepared to give up even an inch of its interests in Spain. Washington does not have to take into consideration the position of the Socialist government, which insists on a substantial reduction of the U.S. military contingent stationed in the four Pentagon bases. On the other side of the ocean they do not even want to talk about this reduction, and want even less to discuss the elimination of their military bases which Spanish public opinion energetically demands, as it considers them a real threat to the country's security.

Treating Spain like a minor partner, the spokesmen for the Reagan adminstration say without any secrets that what Madrid must do is think more about its contribution to NATO defense than about the reduction of the U.S. military presence. Washington's position in all the rounds of the negotiations is characterized by the tactics of linkage. On the other side of the ocean they stress that a real reduction of U.S. troops in Spain could only be discussed after the country's integration into the NATO military structure. The meeting between Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez Ordonez and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz was precisely in this spirit. Washington constantly reminds the Moncloa Palace [prime minister's residence] that mutual commitments on the defense of the West and the Pentagon military bases represent a firm shield in the NATO system. In this way Spain is given the role of a NATO rear-guard base in case of a military conflict, a role of co-participant in the U.S. militaristc plans, which is not to be envied.

This is the essence of the Iberian policy of the United States, and the U.S. delegation has followed this policy at all stages in the negotiations on the bases. For the moment the only concession Washington has made has been the partial replacement of its auxiliary personnel at Torrejon base by civilians and Spanish workers. The American remain in the base near the Spanish capital.

Meanwhile, Fernandez Ordonez has tried to see whether Turkey would agree to have on its territory part of the basic units -- about 400 [word indistinct] from Torrejon. Perhaps in this way he will manage to remove (?GIs) from the base which is so near Madrid.

DEUTSCHE WELLE'S VIEW ON GERMAN ATTACK SLANDEROUS

PM301539 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jan 87 First Edition p 3

[Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Anfilov article under the rubric "Facts Versus Lies": "Deutsche Welle Mimics Goebbels"]

[Text] Now as the anniversary of M.S. Gorbachev's statement which outlined the program for the creation of a nuclear-free world is being marked everywhere, remarkably West Germany's Deutsche Welle [DW] radio station has dug out from what seems to be a store of fairy tales a forgery entitled "Did Stalin Want to Be the First to Start a War Against Hitler's Germany?" Moreover, it resorted to unforgivable fabrications to convince an inordinately credulous audience that the answer to this provocative question is affirmative. Skilled in anti-Soviet slander, the DW even went as far as claiming that the Soviet Union allegedly was preparing to attack Germany in 1941 and simultaneously was conducting a disinformation campaign aimed at lulling Hitler's vigilance. But Hitler, it claimed, saw through it and delivered a "preemptive" strike against the USSR.

The authors of this ill-intended radio forgery have repeated a stale Goebbels propaganda story. It is universally known that the Goebbels propaganda was the first to attempt to present the treacherous attack on the USSR as a "preemptive" war, apparently launched for the purpose of thwarting a Red Army offensive that was allegedly in preparation. This lie is so blatant that it is refuted out of hand by the testimony of many of Hitler's politicians and generals themselves.

"No change in the Russians' policy toward Germany...could have been expected by anyone," General Tippelskirch, aide to the chief of the Wehrmacht General Staff for intelligence matters, asserted in the past. "On the contrary, the Soviet Union strove, as ever, to fulfill its obligations precisely."

Tippelskirch's chief, General Halder, expressed an even more definite opinion in this context. He wrote in his service diary on 22 March 1941: "I do not consider the likelihood of a Russian initiative." And on 5 May, following a report by Colonel Krebs on returning from Moscow, Halder stressed that "Russia will do everything to avoid war."

Strictly observing the Soviet-German nonaggression pact, the Soviet Government strove not give the slightest pretext for the German militarists to launch an aggression against our country. Confirmation of this is contained in a telegram sent to Berlin by German Ambassador to the USSR Schulenburg on 24 May 1941: "The fact that this foreign policy is aimed primarily at preventing a conflict with Germany is proved by the stance taken by the Soviet Government over the last few weeks, the tone of the Soviet press, which impeccably reports all events involving Germany, and the implmentation of economic agreements concluded with Germany."

So much for the evidence of "Third Reich" figures. It is indeed true that the written word cannot be changed.

This is not the first attempt in the West to present fascist Germany's treacherous attack on the Soviet Union as a "preemptive" war. This gross forgery, now being repeated by DW, pursues the goal of diminishing the importance of the USSR's peace-loving actions, giving a semblance of veracity to the myth about the "Soviet military threat," and justifying the aggressive plans by today's bellicose imperialist circles, eager to secure social revenge. But no one has the power to reverse the course of history.

REPORTAGE ON BRUTENTS VISIT TO MIDEAST

Meetings With Syria's Al-Ahmar

PM061029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In A Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Damascus, 2 Feb - K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, has arrived in Damascus at the invitation of the Ba'th Party leadership.

Today he met with 'A. al-Ahmar, deputy general secretary of the Ba'th Party. During the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, they touched on matters pertaining to relations between Syria and the Soviet Union and the international situation, including the Near East situation. The successful development of Soviet-Syrian cooperation and party and public links was noted with satisfaction.

Views U.S. Naval Build-up

LD061318 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Beirut February 6 TASS -- The U.S. moves to amass its navy ships in Eastern Mediterranean is a manifestation of the power politics and blackmail conducted by the U.S. Administration against states in that part of the world, said Karen Brutents.

The alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy head of the Central Committee's international department, in an interview with the Lebanese newspaper "AL-SAFIR" today, did not rule out the possibility of the Pentagon launching a military action against Lebanon. He emphasized that the adventure of this kind would have a highly adverse effect on the international climate and spur higher tension in the world.

Touching upon the situation in Lebanon, Brutents said that the Soviet Union supported any steps towards settling the complicated crisis in that country on the basis of preserving its unity, integrity, independence and sovereignty.

Speaking about the Arab-Israeli conflict, Brutents stated that the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East was the sole way towards establishing a just and lasting peace in the region.

U.S. 'Intervention' in Lebanon

NC051954 Paris AFP in English 1943 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Al-Shariqah, United Arab Emirates, Feb 5 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union will react firmly to any military intervention by the United States to free its hostages in Lebanon, a leading Soviet official said in a statement published by the AL-KHALIJ newspaper here Thursday.

Karen Brutents, deputy director of the Middle East Department of the Communist Party Central Committee, said there were several ways Moscow could respond to a U.S. move. But he did not elucidate.

"The American politicians cannot, on a logical basis, go ahead with an aggressive move against Lebanon, because such a move is bound to be gainless and to end in failure," Mr. Brutents added.

Speculation on a possible military move by the United States in Lebanon has grown in the past few days, owing to the presence of U.S. ships off the Lebanese coast.

Mr. Brutents also called for negotiations to end the war between Iran and Iraq, which he said was allowing intervention by "imperialist forces in the region."

He also said Moscow would support moves to bring together the different factions in the Palestinian movement.

U.S. BUILDUP IN MEDITERRANEAN, GULF VIEWED

LD061109 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Radio Lebanon has reported that two U.S. aircraft carriers, the John Kennedy and Nimitz, with their accompanying vessels in full combat-readiness are in the eastern Mediterranean. The Arab countries have heard this report with alarm. Here is what our correspondent in Damascus, Kazbek Basiyev, reports about this:

[Basiyev] At the same time as the active ship movements in the Mediterranean, it has become known that another major U.S. naval unit, headed by the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk, has left the Indian Ocean and is now in the Persian Gulf. The Arab mass information media considers, and with good reason, that the escalation in the presence of U.S. naval forces in the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, and also the recent transfer of U.S. combat aircraft from certain European countries to the region of the Near East, have a quite definite aim which bears a real threat to the security of the Arab states.

In this regard, the papers cite statements by U.S. officials, in particular by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, that the United States of America is prepared to undertake military actions to free U.S. hostages in Lebanon. The SYRIA TIMES writes on this subject that in essence it is a question of a possible incursion by the United States of America into sovereign Lebanon. Commentaries in other mass information media in their turn note that such intentions of the U.S. Administration in effect put the United States of America on the same level as the terrorists, except that here it will be an act of state terrorism against a sovereign state.

TASS CITES 'AL-AKHBAR' ON U.S. CARRIER IN HAIFA

LD061227 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Text] Cairo February 6 TASS -- The U.S. aircraft-carrier John F. Kennedy from an American naval task force off Lebanese shores went today to the Israeli port of Haifa, the Egyptian newspaper AL-AKHBAR reported.

Local commentators said in this connection that U.S. Israeli strategic alliance agreement has effectively made Israeli ports into bases for the U.S. 6th Fleet poised for aggressive activities against Arab countries.

The anti-Arab nature of the alliance of Washington and Tel Aviv has become particularly obvious amid the present tense situation in the Mediterranean, caused by U.S. provocative threats against Lebanon and Iran.

JOINT NEWS CONFERENCE WITH SYRIAN ASTRONAUTS

JN052117 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow -- Soviet and Syrian astronauts held a press conference at the spaceship launching base of Baykonur yesterday. During the press conference they talked about the preparations under way for their coming joint space journey. The two Syrian astronauts, Muhammad Faris and Munir Habib, emphasized their complete readiness to take part in the anticipated journey.

It is worth recalling that the spacecraft Soyuz TM-2 will be launched tomorrow with two Soviet astronauts on board. It will continue to orbit in space until July, when the joint Syrian-Soviet space crew will join them.

IZVESTIYA SEES U.S., FRANCE FUELING CHAD CONFLICT

PM041159 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 5

[M. Pavlov "Pertinent Remarks": "Flames Fanned in Chad"]

[Text] While Algeria, Nigeria, and Sudan are engaged in searching for ways of achieving a peaceful settlement of the Chad problem, France and the United States are banking on military force.

According to reports from Ndjamena, weapons are regularly arriving there. This is confirmed in Washington and Paris, although they keep silent about the scale of the supplies.

According to a LE FIGARO report, Washington has recently supplied Chad with 100 tons of heavy military equipment and two long-range Galaxy aircraft. The United States is examining the possibility of granting Habre additional military aid worth $10 million over and above the $20 million already appropriated.

The Central African Republic, where France has an air force base, is one channel through which the Habre regime is supplied. For example, five American helicopters and one Hercules C-130 together with three French Jaguar aircraft recently arrived in Chad from Bangui. At least 20 French servicemen from the 13th Dragoon parachute regiment (a special subunit coming directly under the chief of staff of the French Armed Forces) have infiltrated the area of combat operations in northern Chad from Niger as part of the French operation to supply weapons to the Tibesti region. Habre now has two battalions of Chadian commandos trained in Zaire at his disposal.

Thus Chad increasingly resembles a major Franco-American military base. (Let us remember that 1,500 servicemen and dozens of bomber, tanker, and reconnaissance aircraft have been stationed on Chadian territory since 1984 as part of France's "Operation Epervier.")

According to a L'HUMANITE report, the French Armed Forces staff is now studying the possibility of carrying out new air raids to support Ndjamena, which is trying to seize northern Chad (which is controlled by troops belonging to the Transitional Government of National Unity). Habre had previously obtained assurances that he would be rendered this "service." Enjoying the all-around support of France and the United States, he belligerently states that "Chad must free itself by force of arms."

The massive deliveries of weapons to the Ndjamena puppets is accompanied by the spreading of fabrications alleging that Tripoli is hindering a settlement. "We are seeking to cooperate in order to find a reliable solution to the Chad crisis," Libyan representatives. 'A. al-Turayki has stated. "The problem is purely Chadian and must be settled by political, not military means. Non-African countries should refrain from interfering in Chad's internal conflict."

But that is just what Paris and Washington refuse to heed as they work to aggravate this dangerous center of tension in Africa.

ANNIVERSARY MESSAGES EXCHANGED WITH GHANA

PM301415 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Anniversary Commemorated"]

[Text] On the 5th anniversary of the revolution of 31 December 1981, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent to J. Rawlings, head of state and chairman of the Ghanaian Provisional National Defense Council, a telegram conveying cordial congratulations and best wishes to the country's leadership and the friendly Ghanaian people. The Soviet Union, the telegram notes, follows with a sense of understanding and solidarity the efforts of the Ghanaian people aimed at resolving the complex sociopolitical problems confronting the country and the achievements of the last 5 years in strengthening Ghana's political independence and economic autonomy.

In his reply telegram, J. Rawlings expressed thanks for the warm congratulations on the noteworthy date and voiced the hope that, given the support of friendly states like the Soviet Union and hard work by the Ghanaian people, the problems confronting the country will be solved.

The telegrams stress the sides' desire to further develop friendly relations between the USSR and Ghana for the benefit of both countries and for the sake of the triumph of peace and international security.

ARGENTINA PROTESTS UK ZONE AROUND FALKLANDS

LD020809 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 2 Feb 87

[Text] Buenos Aires February 2 TASS -- The Argentine News Agency Telam said that the "Argentine coastguard ships are on routine patrol duty in the waters of the south Atlantic." This report came after London unilaterally imposed a ban on the call of foreign ships, which have no special permission for that, in the so-called 150 mile "exclusive fishing zone" around the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands occupied by Britain. The demarche of the Thatcher government has aroused indignation not only in Argentina but also all over Latin America, whose public is protesting against the deliberate sharpening of the situation in the region by Britain.

In face of London's provocative steps, the Argentine Government has again declared its preparedness to start talks with Britain immediately on a settlement of the problem of the Falkland Islands, which was repeatedly stressed in the appeals to both countries by the United Nations Organisation. The latest statement by the Argentine Foreign Ministry stresses that the government intends to act consistently and calmly, using all possible diplomatic channels and striving to avoid armed incidents in the south Atlantic.

Britain's unilateral decision has touched off a wave of protests in Argentina. A demonstration was held downtown Buenos Aires, whose participants demanded that this measure be cancelled. The coalition of the left-wing forces of Argentina the popular front has condemned Britain's actions. Its statement stresses that London's action is an encroachment upon Argentina's sovereignty, such actions, the document stresses, are part and parcel of the policy of Britain and the U.S. aimed at laying their hands on the natural resources of the south Atlantic and creating their base there.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS CONTADORA 'PEACE MISSION' OUTCOME

PM301113 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Silantyev report under rubric "Reports From Abroad": "Against Diktat and Aggression"]

[Text] Mexico City -- The peace mission conducted under the aegis of the Contadora Group, the Support Group, the UN secretary general, and the OAS secretary general aimed at achieving a settlement of the situation in Central America as soon as possible has reached its conclusion.

According to statements by those who took part in the Mexico City mission, the most immediate task was resolved: to activate the Contadora process, which has been marking time since last summer. This fact attests to the success of the mission -- a mission which people on the banks of the Potomac intended should fail and which had all manner of obstacles put in its way. The Nicaraguan newspaper BARRICADA was right when it wrote, commenting on the results of the peace mission, that the Reagan administration had failed in its attempts to wreck the work of "the ten" (the UN and OAS secretaries general and eight foreign ministers).

The constructive nature and positive results of the talks held by these 10 senior political figures are perfectly obvious. At news conferences given in Mexico City, the participants in the mission noted that they would be sparing no effort to reach specific decisions. UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar stressed, however, that the leaders of the Central American countries still lack sufficient political will for this. Faced with the threat of war breaking out, the diplomatic mediation of the Contadora Group has become more urgent than ever before, because life has shown that no other organization can pursue its peace efforts. Perez de Cuellar went on to point out that the possibility of bringing in UN troops for peace-keeping in Central America is ruled out. In any event, this purely Latin American problem must be settled by the Latin Americans themselves without outside interference.

It is hardly necessary to explain what interference is meant. "The truth is that Central American governments lack the necessary political will because of their subordination to the great power in the Western Hemisphere, which keeps the majority of countries in the region under its heel," the newspaper ULTIMAS NOTICAS wrote, commenting on the results of the mission's work. Argentine Foreign Minister Dante Caputo expressed the same idea in saying that, by giving aid to the "Contras," the United States is acting at variance with one of the main principles of the Contadora Group -- refusal to support "irregular troops trying to overthrow a government."

The results of the peace mission show the difficulties, on the one hand, which have to be overcome for the sake of a peace settlement in the region and, on the other, the continuing polarization of views between Washington and the overwhelming majority of Latin American countries.

NICARAGUA SAYS MEETING TO 'SABOTAGE' CONTADORA

LD311057 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 31 Jan 87

[Text] Managua January 31 TASS -- The Nicaraguan Government has described the forthcoming presidential meeting of Central American countries in San Jose, to which Nicaragua has not been invited, as a sabotage of the Contadora process.

A statement issued by the country's Foreign Ministry in Managua Friday said that the meeting would undermine the efforts of the Contadora Group and the Contadora Support Group aimed at a political settlement of the Central American crisis, and was another manifestation of the United States' interventionist policy bringing death and destruction to peoples in the region.

The leaders of Costa Rica, El Salvador and Honduras are expected to take part in the meeting. Guatemalan President Vinicio Cerezo said he would not join them if Nicaraguan leader Daniel Ortega was not invited.

SHEVARDNADZE MEETS WITH CONTADORA GROUP MEMBERS

FL291920 Mexico City NOTIMEX in Spanish 0452 GMT 28 Jan 87

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jan (NOTIMEX) -- Mexican Ambassador to Moscow Horacio Flores de la Pena said here today that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has expressed the Soviet Union's support for the peace efforts carried out by the Contadora and Support Groups in Central America.

On 26 January, Shevardnadze received the ambassadors from Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Argentina, Peru and Uruguay -- members of the Contadora and Support Groups -- who were in the Soviet Union to present the joint communique issued at the conclusion of their recent tour through Central America with UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and OAS Secretary General Joao Baena Soares.

Flores de la Pena said the eight members of the Contadora and Support Groups (Panama and Brazil round off the peace mission in Central America) hope they can count on the same support from the United States in the immediate future.

According to the Mexican Embassy in Moscow, Shevardnadze reiterated that the Kremlin supports and will continue to support the peace group's efforts. If they achieve their goals, he added, this would set an example in resolving regional problems in other parts of the world.

The Mexican Embassy added that the Soviet foreign minister said this peace mission was a method of making the solution to regional conflicts more democratic.

REAGAN ADVISER CARLUCCI LEAVES ON C. AMERICA TOUR

LD300052 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 29 Jan 87

[Text] Washington January 29 TASS -- The U.S. President's National Security Adviser Frank Carlucci today leaves on a Central American tour which will take him to El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala.

The high-powered team he is leading also includes Elliot Abrams, assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, and Jose Sorsano, special assistant to the president for national security affairs.

According to a White House statement, this will be, by and large, a get-acquainted trip.

By the accounts of officials who asked not to be identified, however, the aim of the fact-finding missions will instead be to identify the potentialities of the Contras sheltered in the territories of these countries in what concerns armed aggression against Nicaragua.

This is borne out also by American press reports on a stepup in activities by Nicaraguan counter-revolutionary forces in these regions of late, clearly on orders from Washington.

The press said, in particular, that the Honduran-based Contras were re-grouping for an incursion into Nicaragua. The U.S. national security adviser during the tour will be putting out feelers on this score.

POLITBURO DISCUSSES CONSUMER GOODS COOPERATIVES

LD052311 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo -- At a session that took place on 5 February, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed and approved the measures for setting up cooperatives in the areas of the production of consumer goods, consumer service and public catering, drafted by the government on the basis of the decisions of the 27th party congress and January plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. As was noted at the session, the cooperatives are called upon to promote fuller satisfaction of population's demand for public catering produce, consumer services and consumer goods and to supplement in these areas the operating system of state enterprises and organizations.

In accordance with draft regulations, the cooperatives will be working on the basis of self-recouping and self-financing and will bear the full responsibility for the results of their economic activity. It is planned to engage pensioners and other citizens not occupied in public-sector production, and also students in the work of the cooperatives. Local party and soviet bodies were invited to render all possible assistance in setting up cooperatives and in their successful work.

At the politburo session, the issue of improving the conditions for the work of creative unions was examined. It was stressed that the further development of Soviet literature and art and the enhancement of their roles in the spiritual life of the society are presenting creative unions with important tasks in producing ideologically and artistically significant works of all kinds and genres. Taking this into account, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decision detailing the measures to make the work of the Unions of Writers, Cinematographers, Composers. Theater Figures and Artists more active, to strengthen the material-technical base of these unions, building living accommodations, and Houses of Creativity, and also to improve publishing activity and the propagation of literature and the arts.

A decision by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee on the further development of amateur technical creative work was adopted. It envisages setting up clubs for technical creative work at enterprises, organizations, Palaces and Houses of Culture and other institutions of the executive committees of town and rayon soviets of people's deputies and providing them with equipment, tools and materials. The corresponding ministries and departments were instructed to work out a system for financing the clubs and for their material-technical maintenance, and also for encouraging the authors of the best designs.

Measures were outlined concerning the reinforcement the propagation and amateur creative activities, and the regular holding of festivals, competitions and exhibitions of samples of technology. The leading machine-building ministries responsible for developing such creative work with the main kinds of equipment were specified. The coordination of this work was entrusted to the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries.

The results of the work of the Party Control Committee of the CPSU Central Committee for 1986 were discussed. It was pointed out that the Party Control Committee had strengthened its supervision of the implementation of the decisions by the 27th CPSU Congress, and of the Central Committee, on the focal questions of socio-economic development, strengthening party and state discipline, asserting Leninist norms in party life and fighting negative phenomena.

Having approved the activity of the Party Central Committee, the Politburo stressed that ensuring the effective checking of the implementation of party decisions and improving control work is one of the most important tasks of party control bodies. It is necessary to conduct strict supervision of cadres work in all sectors of party, state, economic and social life. It is of fundamental importance to strengthen the fight with inertia, bureaucratism, and other phenomena alien to socialism, to make strict demands of every leader, every communist regarding observance of the requirements of the CPSU Program and Statute and norms of communist ethics.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed certain other issues of organizational work to implement the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee plenum of January 1987, party and state construction and also of foreign policy activity directed at ensuring peace and security for the peoples.

MVD'S VLASOV ON UKRAINIAN STAFFERS' PUNISHMENT

PM291747 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 87 First Edition p 2

[Letter from A. Vlasov, USSR minister of internal affairs, under the rubric "Following an Item in PRAVDA": "'Overstepping the Mark'"]

[Text] The USSR MVD has examined the item published 4 January 1987 entitled "Overstepping the Mark" and reporting violations of socialist legality committed by staffers of Voroshilovgrad Oblast law enforcement organs against V.B. Berkhin, chief of the correspondent's office of the journal SOVETSKIY SHAKHTER.

The facts described in the articles were verified in the course of an on-the-spot investigation. It was established that staffers of Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's internal affairs organs were under the thumbs of some oblast leaders and were involved in a campaign to compromise the journalist and settle a score with him. The violations of socialist legality committed in the process were the result of unscrupulousness and loss of political and legal vigilance by investigation officials, poor standards of leadership and monitoring by G.M. Vetrov, chief of Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration, and his deputy Yu.P. Yeroshkin, and also a failure to exercise control on the part of the Ukrainian SSR MVD.

By a decision of the USSR MVD V.N. Ryazanov, senior investigator from the Investigations Department of Voroshilovgrad's Artemovskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, has been dismissed from the internal affairs organs for violations of legality. V.M. Molodyk, chief of the Investigations Administration of Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration, has been removed from his post and will be demoted. A similar decision has been taken as regards S.I. Fedorchuk, chief of Voroshilovgrad Gorispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration, who illegally interfered in the investigators' procedural activity by encouraging them to take illegal actions.

G.M. Vetrov, chief of Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration, and Yu.P. Yeroshkin, deputy chief of the same administration, have been severrly reprimanded for failing to ensure proper monitoring of their subordinates' observance of the demands of criminal and criminal procedure legislation. Furthermore, Comrades Vetrov, Fedorchuk, and Molodyk have also been punished by the party.

G.V. Berdov, Ukrainian SSR deputy minister of internal affairs, was severely censured for a lack of due principledness in appraising the measures taken against the guilty parties by Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration.

Other persons guilty of violations of legality have been punished by the Ukrainian SSR minister of internal affairs.

The violations case was discussed at a session of the Ukrainian SSR MVD Collegium and a meeting of Voroshilovgrad Oblispolkom's Internal Affairs Administration party aktiv, both of which took principled decisions.

The USSR MVD order on the case of the extraordinary occurrence in Voroshilovgrad has been conveyed to all internal affairs organs in the country. Instructions have been given for firm measures to be taken to stamp out any display of prejudice or bias when conducting inquiries or preliminary investigations, as well as instances of unjustified detention or arrest, the illegal institution of criminal proceedings against citizens, bureaucracy, callousness, and indifference to people's fate or to the defense of the working people's legitimate rights and interests.

The fulfillment of this order will be monitored.

A. Vlasov, USSR minister of internal affairs.

UKRAINIAN CP CC POLITBURO REPRIMANDS MINISTERS

AU221317 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 18 Jan 87 pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has analyzed the main lines of work performed by the Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat in 1986. It was noted that the objective of this work was to implement in practice the policy worked out by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenum and the 27th party congress to restructure work and to accelerate socioeconomic progress. Principal tasks have been determined for the further work to perfect the style, to improve the selection, distribution, and education of cadres, to make economic development more dynamic, to ensure qualitative changes in all spheres of public life, and to enhance the initiative of the communists and the activity of the masses.

The socialist pledges adopted by the labor collectives of the Ukrainian SSR to successfully meet the targets set for the 12th 5-year period and to welcome the 70th anniversary of the Great October in a worthy manner have been approved. The objective of these pledges is to hasten the pace of economic growth, and to pursue the social policy worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress. The pledges have given prominence to the efforts to make fuller use of the production and scientific potential, to widely apply new methods of management, to raise labor productivity and the quality of production, to carry out contract obligations for supplies, to save all kinds of resources, and to improve production, housing, cultural, and service conditions for the working people. The pledges will be published in the press.

The Politburo has examined the ways to intensify organizational work in order to implement special purpose scientific and technological programs. In the adopted decision, measures have been drawn up to purposefully increase the role of these programs in accomplishing the tasks set for economic development. Instruction has been given to single out in each of these programs the leading technological sectors on which organizational work has to be concentrated. The same is to be done in branch and regional programs. Local party and administrative organs have been instructed to more vigorously mobilize local resources to accelerate scientific-technological progress. For this purpose, fuller use has to be made of the provided new management conditions, to expand the practice of organizing inter-branch production, and to associate enterprises.

The Central Committee Politburo has approved the measures drawn up to improve the supply of the republic's population with foodstuffs in 1987. Concrete measures have been determined to maximally increase the production, procurement, and processing of plant growing and stock breeding produce by widely applying new management methods, intensive technologies, and advanced methods of labor organization and payments. Administrative and economic organs have been obligated to intensify at all levels the struggle to cut short losses in agricultural production, and to improve the quality of produce. Provisions have been made to supply private subsidiary holdings with fodder, young animals and poultry.

In conformity with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, measures have been drawn up to improve pedigree breeding in the republic.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has also examined the work performed by the Ukrainian Ministry of Justice to strengthen legality, law and order in light of the 27th CPSU Congress requirements. It has been noted that the ministry was unsatisfactory in discharging the obligations imposed on it in organizational leadership over courts and juridical institutions. Comrade V.I. Zaychuk, Ukrainian minister of justice and CPSU member, has been reprimanded for the serious omissions in control over the activity carried out by courts and juridical organs to strengthen socialist legality and law and order.

Measures have been endorsed to comply with the CPSU Central Committee decision to further strengthen socialist legality, law and order, and to intensify the protection of citizens' rights and legal interests.

The state of and measures to improve the safety of exhibits in the republic's museums have been examined. In the adopted decision, the attention of Comrade Yu. A. Olenenko, Ukrainian minister of culture, and Comrade V.B. Vrublevskaya, deputy minister, was strictly called to the lack of effective control over the compliance with party and government decisions concerning the safety of museum exhibits on the part of the ministry, oblast administrations for culture, and the main culture administration under Kiev Gorispolkom, and to the uncritical attitude taken by the latter to the shortcomings existing in this sphere. The Ukrainian Ministries of Culture, of Internal Affairs, and other ministries and departments in charge of museums, as well as oblispolkoms, Kiev and Sevastopol Gorispolkoms have been requested to see to it that the safety of museum valuables is radically improved.

UKRAINIAN OFFICIALS RETIRE 'FOR HEALTH REASONS'

AU281238 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 24 Jan 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade O. Ya. Kasyanenko of the duties of Ukrainian minister of light industry in connection with his retirement on pension for health reasons.

The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade V.I. Degtyarev of the duties of chairman of the Ukrainian State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision in connection with his retirement on pension for health reasons.

New Minister Appointed

AU281243 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 24 Jan 87 p 2

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves to appoint Comrade Grigoriy Grigoryevich Nikitenko Ukrainian minister of light industry.

[Signed] V. Shevchencko, chairman, and N. Khomenko, secretary of the Ukranian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

City of Kiev, 22 January 1987

Born in 1941, Comrade G.G. Nikitenko is a Ukrainian and has been a CPSU member since 1970. He graduated from the Light Industry Technological Institute, and is an engineer-technologist in garment production.

Engaged in light industry since 1963, he has been a cutter, a shop chief, chief engineer, and director general of the Vorovskiy Garments Production Association in Odessa. In the Ukranian Ministry of the Light Industry, he has headed the Ukrainian Institute for the Selection of Light Industry Production and Clothing Fashions, the Administration for Organizing the Production of New Kinds of Goods and Supplies, and the Ukrainian Industrial Garments Association, and from July 1985 he has been Ukrainian deputy minister of the light industry.

He has been awarded the Labor Red Banner Order and a medal.

Committee Chairman Appointed

AU281244 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 24 Jan 87 p 2

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves to appoint Comrade Anatoliy Fedorovich Dyuba chairman of the Ukrainian State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision.

[Signed] V. Shevchencko, chairman, and N. Khomenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

City of Kiev, 23 January 1987

Born in 1940, Comrade A.F. Dyuba is a Russian and a CPSU member since 1966. He has a higher education, graduated from the Donetsk Polytechnical Institute, and is a mining engineer.

He began his career in 1957 as an electric fitter in a mine. Having graduated from the institute, he worked as a mine foreman, a sector deputy chief and chief, a deputy chief engineer, party committee secretary, and director of a mine, as technical director and chief engineer of a coal mining production association, and as an adminstration chief in the Ukrainian Ministry of the Coal Industry. In 1985 he was appointed director general of the "Oktyabrugol" Production Association, and in 1986, Ukrainian deputy minister of the coal industry.

He is a bearer of the Badge of Honor Order and of a medal.

SHCHERBITSKIY MEETS RURAL RAYKOM SECRETARIES

AU292018 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 25 Jan 87 p 2

[RATAU report: "A Meeting With Rural Raykom Secretaries"]

[Text] On 24 January V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, met a group of rural raykom first secretaries undergoing training in the Higher Party School under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

During a conversation it was noted that, in line with the 27th CPSU Congress directives, the CPSU Central Committee had been taking consistent measures to restructure all areas of public life, and to foster new approaches toward the settlement of social and economic problems. The human factor is invigorating, more attention is being paid to the social sphere, democracy is expanding, and openness is being promoted.

Owing to the measures taken since the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenum, the pace of socioeconomic development has hastened. In a number of important indexes, in 1986 the national economy of the country, including the Ukraine, reached the average 5-year level. A rather good base has been created for the future.

At the same time, the 1986 results show that the restructuring work has not met the requirements everywhere. In a number of places, this work is still progressing slowly, sluggishly. There are many shortcomings and unutilized reserves. Adherence to the old methods of work is the main hindrance. Some party committees interpret the purport of restructuring in a simplified way; they have linked it with restricting the number of sessions and papers, but actually have failed to set about restructuring in earnest.

Meanwhile, the only way to accelerate socioeconomic development is to restructure the methods of party leadership. Party gorkoms and raykoms are obligated to analyze the processes taking place in socioeconomic and public life thoughtfully, to assess them in a politically correct way, to time well the measures they take, to learn to see phenomena in their grassroots, to resolutely get rid of routine, and to give up the practice of substituting for administrative and economic organs. To be aware of the state of affairs, it is important not only to go through reports, but also to make one's own observations while visiting labor collectives and establishing contacts with people. While summing up the results of socialist competitions, it is essential to avoid ostentation and sensation, and to see first of all how economic and social tasks set under the 5-year plan are being accomplished. As an important link in restructuring, gorkoms and raykoms are expected to set an example in its implementation, and to increase their role of political leadership organs.

Cadre work, V.V. Shcherbitskiy emphasized, is to be in the foreground. An instructive experience has been accumulated in this respect, for example, by Tarashchanskiy Raykom in Kiev Oblast, Kostopolskiy Raykom in Rovno Oblast, Kolomyyskiy Raykom in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast, Chemerovetskiy Raykom in Khmelnitskiy Oblast, and others. At the same time, there are also quite a few serious shortcomings. In the selection, distribution, and education of cadres, there are occasionally manifestations of stagnation or, on the contrary, ill considered and hasty staff reshuffles. Each party committee is expected to see what has to be done to raise cadre work to the level of the outstanding tasks. In this respect, it is highly important to observe the principles of collectivism and of openness in the selection of cadres, to carefully study the opinions of party organizations and labor collectives, and to create a reliable reserve of efficient cadres. [paragraph continues]

Restructuring calls for the democratization of the entire cadre work, for manning responsible posts with talented and energetic people, with innovators who courageously break routing canons and are able to lead people behind them.

The Leninist style of party work has to be fostered everywhere. Party committees are expected to be more business-like and concrete in their activity, to be perfectly aware of the needs and demands of the working people, to resolutely eradicate the practice of running the business by means of order and decrees, and to fight the manifestations of bureaucratism. The party organizations of Pervomyrskiy Rayon in Nikolayev Oblast, of Apostolovskiy Rayon in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, and of a number of other rayons were submitted to sharp criticism for formalism in their work. Party committees have to tighten control over the implementation of their own decisions, to boost the role of elective bodies, and to improve information for the communists. It is essential to promote criticism and self-criticism, and to see to it that atmosphere is business-like and exacting at all aktivs meetings and plenums.

And important conditions for restructuring are improvements in the ideoeducational activity of party organizations. Individual work among people, primarily among laggards and persons who are passive in public life, is of particular importance. A party functionary is expected to make more frequent calls at production collectives, night shifts, workers dormitories, and dining rooms, and to be well aware of the working people's moods. A creative attitude is to be taken toward educational work among young people.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy also touched upon a number of questions concerning party leadership in the economy. In particular he noted that the great potential accumulated by the republic's State Agro-Industrial Committee still has not been utilized with sufficient effectiveness, particularly in grain farming, as was correctly pointed out by the CPSU Central Committee. The need was emphasized to take the additional measures worked out by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee in order to increase the productivity and stability of grain farming, and to widely apply intensive technologies and the advanced forms of labor organization and motivation. Emphasis was also put on the need to make use of all reserves in order to increase the production and procurements of meat, milk, and other products, and to improve their supplies to the population.

Concrete tasks were set for 1987.

INFORMATION REPORT ON TAJIK CP CC PLENUM

PM291645 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 18 Jan 87 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on a Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The regular Fifth Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held in Dushanbe 17 January.

Taking part in the plenum's work were party gorkom and raykom first secretaries, gorispolkom and rayispolkom chairmen, and leaders and secretaries of party organizations in ministries, departments, major industrial enterprises, construction organizations, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes who are not members of Central Committee; senior officials from the apparatus of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, the Gosplan, the Tajik Trade Union Council, and the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee; chairmen of republic trade union committees; specialists dealing with labor resources questions; representatives of mass news and propaganda media.

The Tajik Communist Party Central Committee plenum examined the following questions:

1. Current conditions and measures to fundamentally improve the utilization of the republic's labor resources in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

2. The briefing paper "On the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee's Work in the Period since the 20th Tajik Communist Party Congress."

I.Kh. Khayeyev, chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report to the plenum on the first item on the agenda.

The following took part in the discussion on the report: Comrades Sh. Kalandarov, Tajik SSR minister of light industry; R.Z. Mirzoyev, first secretary of the Dangarinskiy Party Raykom; A.T. Kasymova, chairman of the republic Women's Council and secretary of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; M. Khusinov, drill operator at the Anzob mining and enriching combine; K.M. Makhmudova, full-time trade union committee chairman on Matchinskiy Rayon's Kuybyshev Kolkhoz; R.K. Alimov, first secretary of the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee; A. Kasimov, first secretary of the Kurgan-Tyube Party Obkom; S. Sharipov, first secretary of Zafarobodskiy Party Raykom; B.K. Kadyrov, shepherd on Leninskiy Rayon's Khasan Sovkhoz; Yu.F. Ponosov, second secretary of Gorno-Badakhshanskiy Party Obkom; Yu.A. Shokarimov, chairman of the Tajik SSR State Committee for Labor; and Doctor of Economic Sciences R.K. Rakhimov, director of the republic Academy of Sciences Economics Institute.

P.K. Luchinksiy, second secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the plenum.

The Central Committee plenum adopted an appropriate resolution on the questions under discussion.

K.M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, reported to the plenum on the briefing paper "On the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee's Work in the Period since the 20th Tajik Communist Party Congress."

The following took part in the discussion on the briefing paper: Comrades N.G. Savchenkov, chief of the "Rogungesstroy" Construction Administration; M.S. Asimov, president of the republic Academy of Sciences; M.S. Tabarov, first secretary of Ordzhonikidzeabad party gorkom; I.F. Dedov, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Peopale's Poet of Tajikistan M. Mirshakarov; M. Makhmadaliyev, chairman of Voseyskiy Rayon's Lenin Kolkhoz; Sh.M. Sultanov, first secretary of Tsentralnyy Party Raykom.

The plenum approved the briefing paper and instructed members and candidate members of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee and members of the Tajik Communist Party Auditing Commission to present it to primary party organizations.

The plenum examined organizational questions.

T.M. Mirkhalikov was relieved of his duties as Central Committee secretary and member of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Bureau in connection with his election as first secretary of Leninbad Party Obkom.

The plenum appointed A.B. Karakulov chief of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Section.

The plenum appointed I.Ya. Kamilov chief of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Industry Section.

D. Ashurov was appointed editor of the journal KOMMUNISTI TOJIKSTON, and M.M. Mukhabbatshoyev was appointed editor of the republic newspaper TOJIKSTONI SOVETI.

Having failed to justify the confidence of communists, S. Dzhumayev, G.M. Klyukin, U. Khasanov, and N. Shorakhmanov were deprived of membership of the Central Committee, and M. Saidova of candidate membership of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee.

The plenum promoted D.L. Latifov, chief of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Propaganda and Agitation Section; D.I. Popov, republic minister of communications; and M. Salikhov, leader of a team of plasterers at the "Dushanbestroy" Trust's No. 14 Construction Administration, from candidate to full members of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee.

Thus the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee plenum ended its work.

ECONOMIST INTERVIEWED ON GORBACHEV'S REFORMS

AU051726 Vienna KURIER in German 5 Feb 87 p 5

[Hans Rauscher "Interview with Soviet Expert Primakov" -- date and place not given]

[Text] Kremlin chief Gorbachev incessantly speaks of "frankness," "restructuring" and even "democratization." What does this mean specifically? KURIER put questions about all this to a leading Soviet expert, Yevgeniy M. Primakov, director of the renowned Institute for World Economy and International Relations in Moscow, who was also on Gorbachev's team of experts in Geneva and Reykjavik and recently participated in the Central Committee plenum at which Gorbachev explained his reform plans. The interview was conducted by Hans Rauscher.

[KURIER] What do "restructuring" and "democratization" in the Soviet economy mean? Central planning remains, after all...

[Primakov] The entire life of an enterprise will change. To date an enterprise director was a man who expects instructions from above and who carries them out with all means available.

[KURIER] Or not...

[Primakov] All this was too schematic. There will be entirely different interests now. The enterprise management must also take into consideration things such as modernization and improvement of product quality, because the salaries of the enterprise personnel will now depend on the profit. In addition, election of directors by the enterprise personnel will be introduced. This implies that I can vote my director out of his office if he makes less profit than another one.

[KURIER] In that case many enterprise directors will be voted out of office because for 70 years they have been used to receiving orders from the ministry or from the "Gosplan" planning authority.

[Primakov] This is not quite correct. We have not had this system since the revolution of 1917 but only since the thirties (since Stalin's industrialization program [KURIER editorial note]. In addition, earlier it was predominantly engineers; today also graduates of humanistic sciences, lawyers stand at the head of enterprises. I am 100 percent convinced that the function of the ministries will not remain what it is now and many of them will disappear. The function of central bureaucracies such as "Gosplan" and "Gossnab" (responsible for planning and the distribution of resources [KURIER editorial note] will change. This means in the specific world of labor that the worker will be much more of a master of his enterprise.

[KURIER] Why?

[Primakov] He exerts an influence on the appointment of the director. Several candidates will be presented for the election. Naturally, recommendations will be given, but one can agree with such a recommendation or not. This is the new openness.

[KURIER] What does democratization imply in politics? May abuses also be criticized? This is a lot for the Soviet Union but it still is no democracy.

[Primakov] Agreed! But we will also organize the voting system. The voters will have a choice.

[KURIER] But only between several party candidates for certain offices up to that of a regional party secretary. And there are to be secret ballots for the first time.

[Primakov] Such ballots exist at a low level even now. But this is what our democracy consists of: We do not say this is the clear-cut pattern as to what the election reform should look like but we will discuss it: Next year there will be a party conference on this.

[KURIER] The last Soviet leader who wanted far-reaching reforms was Khrushchev. He also predicted in the fifties that the Soviet Union would have caught up with and overtaken the United States by 1980.

[Primakov] Today we are more serious than we were at that time. We are no longer setting definite deadlines for ourselves. In technology we are lagging behind the United States even though we are ahead of it in basic research and in some areas.

[KURIER] But the military picks the best heads and gets most of the money.

[Primakov] This only applies to a certain degree. But this is why we want to put an end to the arms race.

PRAVDA ON REQUIREMENT FOR GREATER DEMOCRATISM

PM031055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Maximum Democracy: No Mere Slogan but the Essence of Restructuring"]

[Text] Ensuring maximum democracy in the socialist system whereby people feel themselves to be master and creator is the essence of restructuring and an indispensable condition for the success and irreversibility of the revolutionary transformations outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

We will be able to really increase the people's initiative and creativity," the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) plenum noted, "if our democratic institutions exert a vigorous and real influence upon the state of affairs in every labor collective, whether this concerns planning, labor organization, allocation of material and other benefits, or selection and promotion of the most authoritative and competent people to leadership posts."

And the more quickly every Soviet person experiences these changes for himself, the more active will be his civic stance and involvement in public and state affairs.

The economy is the crucial area of the life of society. Tens of millions of people are employed here. The attitude they adopt to their daily work -- the attitude of real representatives of the country or else that of mere executors of someone's instructions -- is by no means a matter of indifference to us. After all, this greatly determines not just the success of our production plans but also the general state of society as a whole. That is why the development of democracy at the workplace and the consistent introduction of the principles of self-management into the work of labor collectives is regarded by the party as a very important area in the deepening and expansion of socialist democracy.

The Law on State Enterprises is designed to implement one of the party congress' most fundamental guidelines -- the line of ensuring that direct democracy is effectively exercised. This involves investing general meetings and councils of labor collectives with the authority to resolve questions concerning production, social and cadre affairs.

The expansion of democracy at the workplace presupposes an organic combination of one-man leadership and collective leadership. "The masses," V.I. Lenin wrote, "should have the right to choose those who are to be entrusted with the responsibility of leadership. The masses should have the right to replace them and to know about and check every move of their activity, no matter how small... But this does not at all mean that the process of collective labor can remain without definite leadership, precise establishment of the leader's responsibility, and very strict order created by the leader's single-mindedness.

In putting these Leninist ideas onto a practical footing by universally applying elective principles when forming enterprises' leading cadres we will be making an important step toward deepening democratic centralism and developing self-management. This measure, the plenum noted, is essential and will undoubtedly meet with working people's approval. Its implementation will produce a qualitatively new situation, a fundamentally different character to working people's involvement in production management, and substantial enhancement of the collective's role and responsibility for the results of its activity.

Improvement of the Soviet electoral system is a fundamantal avenue in the democratization of our life. Like all political, economic, and social insitutions, it must not stagnate or stand aside from restructuring and the new processes developing in society. It is essential to eradicate formalist elements from the practice of nominating and discussing prospective Soviet deputies and to offer voters the opportunity to express their attitude to a large number of candidates and to play an active part in every stage of the electoral process.

Work aimed at strengthening the democratic principles of party life will continue. This also concerns the formation of its elective organs. There is only one criterion here -- the interests of the party and the people. And they demand that elections be approached thoughtfully, in a spirit of high responsibility, that their democratization be regarded as an important condition for enhancing the party's vitality, and that an influx of new people take place to guarantee that the old errors are not repeated.

Restructuring and democratization of society pose particularly keenly the question of intensifying the monitoring of cadres' activity. This primarily concerns creating and strengthening all instruments and forms of real monitoring based on working people and the consistent implementation of the Leninist demand that the work of leading organs be open to all and be carried out in the masses' sight. Every leader and official must constantly be aware of his responsibility and his dependence on the voters, the labor collectives, public organizations, the party, and the people as a whole. It is also essential to ensure the necessary prerequisites -- political and legal -- to ensure that elective bodies exercise effective monitoring of the executive apparatus and its formation and activity.

Openness, criticism, and self-criticism are very important elements of our democracy and socialist way of life. They are essential not just to overcome past shortcomings but are vitally necessary above all to enable us to advance and resolve the enormous tasks ahead. It is now very important that we grasp everything that is positive and constructive, adopt it, make it the property of the whole of the party and the people, and utilize the burgeoning new approaches in the conditions of restructuring. Propagandizing everything that is advanced also forms part of openness. The press, as an active participant in the country's restructuring, must support openness in the country and inform the people in a responsible way, without any sensationalism.

The organic combination of democracy and discipline, autonomy and responsibility, and the rights and obligations of officials and each citizen is a determining trait of socialist democracy. True democracy has nothing to do with total license, irresponsibility, anarchy, or social demagoguery. While protecting the political and social rights of everyone it also serves every collective and society as a whole and defends their interests. This democracy helps promote the rule of law, the triumph of justice, and the establishment of a moral atmosphere in society in which a person can live freely and work productively.

The strength and effectiveness of our democracy lies in the fact that it stems from the interests of the masses, derives from the masses, and is supported by them. Further expansion of the social base of democracy and more active involvement in state and public life by every citizen -- Communists, nonparty people, veterans, young people, women, and representatives of all strata of the population and all nations and ethnic groups will advance the tasks of speeding up the country's socioeconomic development and the tasks of restructuring.

Making maximum effective use of all the opportunities of socialist self-management by the people and filling the work of the party, soviets, state bodies, public organizations, and labor collectives with profound democratic content means breathing new life into every cell of our social organism, it means giving powerful acceleration, truly in keeping with the October Revolution, to our movement forward.

NOVODEVICHYE CEMETARY REOPENS TO PUBLIC

PM261615 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 4, 25 Jan 87 p 14

[Viktor Grigoryev report: "Step Carefully in Memory"]

[Text] This title might serve as an appropriate notice for the Novodevichye Cemetery now that it has been reopened for visitors.

The following sign, no longer valid, has not yet been taken down: "The cemetery is closed for visitors due to reconstruction". It was not given much credit, though. Those wishing to lay flowers on the graves, say, of Gogol, Stanislavskiy, Bulgakov, Shukshin, Shostakovich or Oistrakh believed that was not the reason.

The Novodevichye Cemetery draws large numbers of people because of the outstanding Party and state personalities buried there, among them Dmitry Ulyanov, Aleksandra Kollontai, Nikolay Podvoysky, Nikita Krushchev, Anastas Mikoyan, and famous military leaders and scientists of world renown.

The uncontrollable crowds did not contribute to the quiet and orderliness so necessary in a place like this. Could a positive solution to the problem be found? Evidently it could. An alternative might have been to conduct guided group tours. As it was, the cemetery was simply closed to the general public in 1976. Since then, only close relatives of people buried there were permitted to pay their visits.

Stanislav Sosenkin, the cemetery director, accompanies the present writer along an alley. A white-marble image of Shalyapin is covered with snow. Vladimir Durov seems to come to the fore from behind the heavy curtains of granite. In the portrait of Erenburg in Picasso's pencil drawing tranferred to metal, one can imagine a vein pulsing in Shukshin's forehead. Why not release the picture-book with these monuments and gravestones? Visitors were barred from the Novodevichye, but it was forgotten that the cemetery itself had become part of our history. Disappointingly, even the precise number of people buried there for 82 years is not known.

Now it has been reopened, and the first typical reaction to the news was one of concern: would thousands of visitors respect the atmosphere of that quiet place? Unrestrained curiosity is the last thing we want there.

YEGOROV REVIEWS SHATROV SERIES ON LENIN

PM261629 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 4, 25 Jan 87 p 11

[Article by Aleksandr Yegorov (not further identified): "Twenty Years After..."]

[Text] The dots in the title are meaningful, if only because they symbolize the continuity of Time, which has played its part in this story.

The four-film series entitled "More About Lenin", based on Mikhail Shatrov's script, had been collecting dust on a shelf for 20 years. It was once suggested that the film should be destroyed. The story of how it was retrieved is worthy of a psychological essay.

Last week, the series was screened on Central TV and immediately became the talking point everywhere. That's not to say that it was a revelation. Over the last twenty years, Mikhail Shatrov has been steadily and effectively handling the Lenin theme both for the cinema ("July 6th") and the theatre ("The Bolsheviks", "Blue Horses on Red Grass", "This Way We Shall Win!"), all of which have followed the early TV series.

However, the screening of the films was a notable event. The series has been a remarkably fresh, substantial and graphic contribution to the difficult overhaul currently taking place in the country. The relevance of the series of our times is due primarily to their makers' frank, open and well-documented position, free of excessive praise.

Following the tradition of Emmanuil Kazekevich's "Blue Notebook", also present in Mikhail Shatrov's own "July 6th", the TV series present Lenin in the throes of fierce political struggle - not only with his sworn enemies, but also with Bolsheviks, as well as political fellow-travellers and temporary allies, every one of whom has a name and a life-proven philosophy, e.g. Spiridonova, Kamkov, Martov, Kollontai, Bukharin.

The verdict that had sealed the fate of the films 20 years ago was that "we have not need for history with such names". As a matter of fact, what was feared was not the names (they can be found in any standard textbook on the history of our Party), but the unabridged scale of polemics which they indulged in with Lenin. It was the fear of the vivid portraits - not caricatures - drawn in the film of Lenin's opponents, who were represented as people whose views, however confined, had been rooted in the complex revolutionary realities. It was their individual views that eventually led some into the enemy camp, and prompted the others to work with Lenin and his comrades.

We certainly need such history, and such artistic perception and reflection of its controversies, in order to understand the regularities of the revolutionary process, in order to get a firm reference point for the poignant polemics with our ideological adversaries who now rejoijce over the "retreat of Bolsheviks", as they had once done over the Brest Peace Treaty and NEP [New Economic Policy]. We also need firmness in our internal debate with those who are shunning the necessary changes in economy through fear of undermining the foundation of socialism. This sharp analogy is promoted by the familiar earnestness of the revolutionary ideas Lenin had combatted untiringly - by persuasion.

The above all are just a few of the thoughts, emotions and problems evoked by the first film in the series, "Voting by Name", which deals with the sharp political struggle around the Brest Peace Treaty.

The other three episodes are not less dramatic and thought-provoking. The drama of the final break with the left-wing SRS (Socialist-Revolutionaries) after the killing of the German Ambassador Baron Mirbach and the July mutiny inspired by the SRS, is reconstructed in "90 Minutes in Lenin's Study". The third film, "The Spirit of Sovnarkom", [Soviet of People's Commissars] reproduces the wonderful atmosphere of the Party's purposeful concerted effort. [paragraph continues]

Lenin's rendezvous with the young revolutionary people, during which the young try to teach "the old man" futurism (what a heart-warming blend of deep respect and comraderie, bordering on condescension on the part of the daredevil youngsters!) is depicted in the final episode entitled "At the Young Artists' Commune".

Which one of the films shall I choose for a short review? Perhaps, "The Spirit of Sovnarkom".

The television bosses that had banned the film did not reveal all their reasons for doing so. They could not help overlooking the open attack on the personality cult in "The Spirit of Sovnarkom." Personality cult is condemned in the film as the phenomenon potentially fraught with the most painful distortions of socialist teaching and practices.

After a protracted illness, following attempted assassination by Kaplan, the doctors finally allowed Lenin to resume work. He was eager to get back to his study and the room where the sittings of the sovnarkom were held. There was only one thing that seriously spoiled his mood: the exaggerated concern for his health which kept his "humble self" too much in the limelight. He severely reprimanded Bonch-Bruyevich for unduly inflated bulletins about his health published by the press. "This should be stopped!" he demanded.

Was that modesty? Well, we have been making too much of this innate (or deliberately cultivated) trail of Lenin's character. More serious and important motives are undoubtedly involved here.

Marxism is fundamentally opposed to glorification and exaltation of particular individuals. Uncritical worshiping of a "hero" (Lenin invariably used the inverted commas with the world) was totally alien to true revolutionaries. Lenin was certainly aware of his standing and authority with the Party, and the people (modesty or no modesty). But every attempt at establishing a cult, reminiscent of the ingrained Russian thirst for a "good tsar", was to be sternly rejected by the revolutionary party, because it paralyzed the creative activity of the masses, the only reliable motive force of the revolutionary process.

These are home truths, of course. But unfortunately, some 20 years ago they were beginning to be forgotten, to put it mildly.

"The Spirit of Sovnarkom" was therefore regarded somewhat out of step with the times.

Moreover, even today, the miasmas of the "small cog in a big wheel psychology" are not only here, but are also actively polluting the atmosphere of social renovation. Every one of us can recall one's own hateful silence in this or that public forum, where those in power silenced those out of power. I for one feel pained and puzzled at the appearance of a monumental Stalin in full regalia of Generalissimo, in the recent documentary "Korolev" about the father of Soviet cosmonautics. I don't mean to say that Stalin's name should be deleted from history the way dozens of other names have been. The situation is highly involved. And it will take years to be fully elucidated. But bluster and pomp without proper explanation are totally unacceptable. True, Stalin realized the great significance of space research and made sure that it was given the best scientists. But the sympathetic-handling of Stalin in the film brings to mind the notorious "Stalin's eagles", "Stalin's artillery" and "Stalin's conquest of nature" (the results of which are only too well known to us) of our not too distant past.

Have I departed from my main topic. "The Spirit of Sovnarkom"? Not at all. Shatrov's film combats the above-mentioned and other phenomena and tendencies in our social life.

Of course, I'm not aiming at an exhaustive assessment of the series. It is sure to attract lots of critical attention.

There is a danger, however, of overestimating the artistic merits of this honest, pertinent and innovatory work. The shortcomings, unfortunately, are as evident as the achievements. Some of the historic personages are outlined dolefully, although they warrant more than just being film extras. One cannot help chuckling at miscasting Yegeniy Yevstigneyev as Lunacharskiy. Many crowd scenes are totally ineffectual.

There would be no point in discussing the film however topical and relevant, if it were fully devoid of artistic merit. It is not. Leonid Pcholkin directs his cast cleverly and precisely. Apparently, the topic and the drama of the script enthralled the actors, many of whom came from the company of the then flourishing Sovremennik (The Contemporary). Special mention should be made of Oleg Tabakov, as Bukharin, Oleg Yrefremov as Martov, and Igor Kvasha as Sverdlov. Towering above them all, but still within reach, is Mikhail Ulyanov as Lenin. His performance, intellect and penetration deserve a special study.

this series is another contribution to the new way of studying Lenin in literature and the arts -- open and unfettered by fear, and free of exaggerated adoration.

PAPER NOTES EFFORTS TO SILENCE INVESTIGATOR

PM051217 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 24 January 1987 carries on pages 2-3 under the headline "A Detective Story About a Detective" a 2,400-word article by special correspondent N. Limonov datelined Kabarda-Balkar ASSR, Moscow. The author profiles Yu.Z. Kalmykov, described as a highly professional and successful investigator at the Nalchik Prosecutor's Office who has unraveled serious crimes involving bribery, embezzlement, and misappropriation of socialist property and saved the state R2 million, and describes the efforts of officials such as Yelkanova, the local ispolkom chairman, to silence him, as a result of which his career has suffered. Kalmykov is described as "a man of the restructuring who implemented its principles long before the word was on everyone's lips."

COSMONAUT TERESHKOVA ELECTED SOD CHAIRPERSON

LD051439 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1403 GMT 5 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS) -- Today, the presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries [SOD] elected Valentina Tereshkova -- The world's first woman cosmonaut -- chairperson of the SOD Presidium. The SOD Presidium relieved Zinaida Kruglova of these duties in connection with her retirement on pension.

ECONOMIST ZASLAVSKAYA ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL REFORM

AU271251 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 24 Jan 87 p 5

[Interview given by Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya, head of the Department for Social Problems of Labor and Social Planning of Labor Resources at the Novosibirsk Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Production of the USSR's Academy of Sciences, to Correspondent Istvan Zalai: "Interview with Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya on the Renewal of the Soviet Society and Economy" -- date and place not given; first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] Tatyana Zaslavskaya, the well-known sociologist and economist who was elected chairman of the Soviet Sociological Association, visited Hungary recently. Our correspondent interviewed Academician Zaslavskaya on the social and economic renewal going on in the Soviet Union and on its results and problems.

The Direction of the Changes [subhead]

[Zalai] Hardly more than a year ago, toward the end of 1985, you made optimistic statements to our newspaper about the chances of the social and economic reform. Has the time that has passed justified your opinion?

[Zaslavskaxya] Yes, it has as a whole. Perhaps the economic reform is advancing slowly, but only 1 year, and even less than that, has passed since the 27th CPSU Congress. Viewed from a historical perspective, this is very little time. No one could believe that the country would change completely overnight. However, the question of whether there are changes, and if so, what is the direction toward which these changes point, is a question of principled importance. The majority of people who support the economic and social reforms feel that the reform's advance is too slow. This is particularly true if someone from the higher echelons of management approaches the issues of direct production; he might have the feeling that nothing has changed. This is like when the water in a large pool is stirred; the waters near the surface will move but nothing will happen at the bottom of the pool. Some time is needed, and not a short time at that, to make the large amount of water move.

[Zalai] This comparison is confirmed by a sociological survey carried out in Leningrad. The workers in 200 enterprises that have been involved in economic experiments since 1984 were asked whether they had experienced genuine changes at their jobs. In the case of 70 percent of the workers surveyed, the answer was no.

[Zaslavskaya] This is completely true. These data were reported at the session of the Soviet Sociological Association held in November 1986. We in Novosibirsk deal primarily with Siberia, and the situation is similar here too. In other words, one can say that the desired change in conditions has not yet affected the lower echelons. Nevertheless, when I come across something that I wrote 2 years ago or even 1 year ago, then I can feel how far we have come. For a long time, for at least 15 years, we have kept repeating the same proposals and nothing has changed.

And, since I am an optimist, I think we are perhaps now witnessing some kind of distortion of the sense of time. Here I mean that, although scientists, workers, and peasants might rightly feel that nothing is happening, in reality a considerable and real change is going on with regard to economic and social relations. Of course, the country is big and its problems are complex. This is also the reason why one might feel that the issues are being solved too slowly. It woud be naive to believe that the desired radical change can be carried out in 1 or 2 years. [paragraph continues]

If we take this task seriously, it will need long years or even a decade to solve. We must also take into consideration the opposition of the state apparatus. To a considerable extent, this is due to the bureaucratization of the central and local organs. But in my view, this type of opposition is natural.

[Zalai] Why?

[Zaslavskaya] It is the result of both the objective situation and the conscious state of society. Many people among those working in the state apparatus sincerely think that things should continue to be as they were. I do no believe that the people who think this way are cold egoists who have considered everything and who say: all this is not in my favor and so I will oppose it. However, behind this opposition is, nevertheless, the fact that the economic reform presupposes a radical decrease in the state apparatus. Let us say the staff of a collective is reduced by one-fifth and no one knows whether he is to stay or not. Where will he go? Where should he go? He is 50 or 55 years old and all he knows is only administrative management. What can he do now? It is only natural that he will oppose the reform. But those who stay on will also have completely different jobs, a much more complex job that requires greater professional training. And finally, the objective situation of these people in the management system will also undergo a change.

The widening of the enterprises' independent rights is achieved through reducing the rights of the people working in management. Now, if a manager himself distributes resources that are in short supply in an administrative way, he can feel like God. Many things depend on him and he has power in his hands. And now he finds himself in a totally different situation. Therefore, the situation of this so-called intermediate stratum, and in reality a very high level stratum, will change considerably. It seems that every one of them can come up with a thousand arguments, as each of them has a lot of experience of life. They can mention the reform brought by Kosygin in 1965 and that we have already tried all this out and got no results, and so on. Of course, within the state apparatus, too, there is a specific group which is interested in reform. Suppose only one-fifth of the previous rights remain in the apparatus; subsequently, one-fifth of the people employed in this apparatus will also remain there. This, however, does not mean that their importance will diminish, on the contrary, they will play a more important role, as they will have to deal with working out the economic strategy. This activity is very prestigious. Who can carry out this work? The strongest and the most energetic people who are able to learn and accept the new ideas.

The Pace of the Reform [subhead]

[Zalai] LITERATURNAYA GAZETA recently published an imaginary dialogue between two party workers on the reforms under way in the Soviet Union. One of them, the older district leader, claimed pessimistically that this was already the third run and, since nothing had come of the previous two, this one would have the same fate. The other worker said that the repeated attempts proved that we needed the reforms.

[Zaslavskaya] I have no doubts whatsoever that the reforms are really very important. There is no alternative to these reforms. The question is rather how these reforms develop. They can develop at a fast rate and in a revolutionary way, a way undoubtedly accompanied by considerable social tensions, and we cannot claim that we are able to forecast every one of these tensions, and where and when they might occur. Lenin differentiated between two ways of agricultural development, an "American" and a "Prussian" way. The previous reform movement fits "the American way". [paragraph continues]

One can also imagine, of course, a much slower and more conservative "Prussian way" which is more cautious and is accompanied by less social tension but which also presents a danger: it might become so cautious that it simply fails to attain the set goals. But even if we follow the Prussian way: for a while, life will force us to shift to the "American way". I believe that the pace and advancement of the reform depends on the efforts made by all of us. In other words, there is great need for social support and social energy.

[Zalai] The fact that the supreme leaders are repeatedly talking about the need for revolutionary transformation shows the interest in the reform. How do you interpret this?

[Zaslavskaya] In my opinion, we are talking here about a comprehensive and radical social and economic reform, because the economic reform strongly affects the interests of the society, that is, this economic reform is of a social character and its implementation is more or less simultaneous and comprehensive. I think this is precisely the fact that is being taken into consideration. But the preliminary condition for its implementation is the existence of an adequately developed reform concept. We can say that the first version of this concept has been prepared. Of course, if the principle of measure seven times and cut once is important for a tailor, then it is several times as important for a serious politician.

I can decide on radical steps when I can see through the entire system, and see the individual steps I want to take and their consequences clearly and precisely.

It is my conviction that, in order to carry out a thorough measurement, we should create a temporary scientific collective including the best professionals in any institute or office, and thus work out a concept that would more or less guarantee an advancement. I said more or less, because the experiments are few and many things should be verified by experiments.

[Zalai] Nevertheless, looking back at the past year, in your opinion what were the most important practical steps?

[Zaslavskaya] I think the law on individual work activity that will be in force as of 1 May 1987 is of considerable importance. This is already a real step, even if there is still a considerable difference between the law and reality.

The other thing I would mention is the creation of the new agricultural-industrial management. It is true tht we prepared a survey involving the district leaders, kolkhop chairmen, and simple workers from the agricultural-industrial complex of Altay area. A general conclusion is that, for the time being, these people deal mainly with the development of new structures and the distribution of functions, and with an understanding of what they are expected to do.

It is difficult for me to talk about industry, as I carry out research involving agriculture. However, I see that it is not easy to extend the experiments in self-financing, the experiences gained at Sum and Togliatti, because the enterprises and the industrial branches are working under very different conditions.

The Role of Criticism [subhead]

[Zalai] There has been a debate going on for months in the CPSU theoretical journal KOMMUNIST on the relations between the economic reform and social justice and on the role played by man in the reform process. You wrote the article that started the debate. What does this category of social justice mean to you?

[Zaslavskaya] Social justice is a philosophical-moral category which is generally very difficult to define. It is a system of social relations which a given historically concrete society accepts as natural and which is not in contradiction to the feelings of this society. Therefore, I imagine there is a point in talking about social justice in our country in the socialist sense of the word. As I have written in my article in KOMMUNIST, under our conditions, the basic principle of socialism -- "from each according to his ability and to each according to his work" -- expresses adequately enough the social-economic aspects of social justice, and at the same time, social justice also has its political aspects which are connected with political rights, possibilities of representation of the interests of various groups, and with the implementation of these interests. Legal justice, about which Gorbachev speaks so often, law being equal for everyone, is extremely important.

Social justice greatly affects the economy and the development of society generally because this ensures that people identify with society and accept the fact that the society in which they live is their society. Therefore, this feeling which is so important from the viewpoint of society's development is fostered not so much by the level of justice already achieved as by the direction of movements. If the people do not feel that we are advancing toward justice, the result is that a considerable number of people will be alienated from social values. One often comes across injustice but if one sees that the party and the state consistently take a stand in favor of asserting justice, then one's commitment to the common cause will also be much greater.

[Zalai] What is it that you regard as the precondition for social justice?

[Zaslavskaya] The democratization of society. You asked me what was the most heartening thing last year. I spoke only about the measures affecting the economy although these measures emerged only recently and it is too early to speak about results. The steps themselves are also only the first ones. Therefore, I would mention something else in the forefront: the signs attesting to the democratization of public life, the completely different press, radio, and television, and the acceleration of public activity. Of course, one can also find arguments that we are fed up with the criticism in the press and the television as there is nothing else in the media but criticism, and when are there going to be changes at last? I think this is an incorrect position. People do not understand how deep we have to dig into our society. It is only now that we are getting to the most acute problems which need solving. The role played by criticism cannot be overestimated. The most important thing is justice. It is like a cold shower. When it becomes uncomfortable, one who would rather run away calls for hot water. That is how things are with us now. The cold shower is on but there is great need for it in order to be able to understand and recognize the actual situation we are in and the tasks facing us. I think this is the guarantee for fitness. If one really understands the reason behind the need for change and if one really wants it, then one will also act to bring about this change. But in order to understand all this, one has to get out of the warm bed and hold it out under the cold shower for his brain to clear. Not everyone likes this and this is only natural.

[Zalai] As you have already mentioned, economic reform is accompanied by social tensions. What is, in your opinion, the reason for this?

[Zaslavskaya] If we want to institute radical changes in the existing system of economic relations, then there will be a relative change in the situation of classes, groups, and strata of society. And since we do not have hundreds of billions of rubles just to take from somewhere to compensate the people who have been negatively affected by the changes, and we can redistribute only the income that is available, then it is quite obvious that all this is an advantage for some groups of the population and a disadvantage for others. [paragraph continues]

Any kind of loss and any kind of deterioration compared to the previous situation will lead to social tension. This is inevitable and it also can happen that the whole of society will be temporarily affected. At the beginning, many relations that have developed over the course of decades must be broken and it will be some time before the new relations emerge and everything finds its place. This is not an easy period in the life of society but it is a necessary one for the benefit of future profits.

For A Change in Public Awareness [subhead]

[Zalai] In your article in KOMMUNIST you mentioned several important issues, among them the question of the manpower released as a result of the spread of intensive and efficient production.

[Zaslavskaya] I analyzed this question in connection with the acceleration of technical and scientific progress. Unfortunately, there is no fast pace in this acceleration so far. However, it is our responsibility to work out solutions for the event that there will be a faster acceleration in this area because when this happens it will be too late to start wondering about it.

The problem, however, is not only the pace of the technical-scientific progress. In agriculture and in other sectors too, some 10-15 percent of the manpower can easily become redundant if we introduce manpower-saving wages. Unemployment should be avoided, that is, these people must be provided with work opportunities as it would not be fair at all just to tell them to go and look for work anywhere they want. In reality, of course, there are a lot of empty workplaces, the technical utilization of machines is very low, and there are services where there is always a shortage of manpower. For example, it is possible that there is redundant manpower employed in the main industrial centers of the country but, at the BAM there is a manpower shortage. But this is a great difference. Therefore, it is necessary to take into consideration the age, the profession, and even the sex of the workers, that is, this is a great problem that we must tackle already.

[Zalai] It transpires also from your article in the debate that you list wage and price reforms among the inevitable steps of economic reform. Why is this necessary?

[Zaslavskaya] First of all because the wage proportions have become totally distorted. And, since we do not have the means at our disposal to do so, we are unable to correct them. It is an accepted principle that no one can have his wages reduced. That is, the increase in wages can derive only from economic growth; but this growth has slowed down, there were no reserves, and thus huge disproportions have emerged. For example, scientific workers' wages have not increased since 1956. The wages of engineers and technicians -- a large group of employees -- are equivalent to and often less than those of the workers. Foremen often take smaller salaries home than their subordinate workers. This state of affairs is due to the fact that we have not carried out a wage reform for 30 years. We only tried to fill up the holes. That is why our coat looks as if it is stitched together haphazardly. Everyone recognizes that there is a need for wage reform but the answer is always the same: there is no money. In my opinion, if several very timely requirements were concentrated into a comprehensive reform, then this reform could be implemented.

The system of consumer prices should also be changed because it has become totally disorganized. The subsidies for meat, milk, and butter are huge, making up some R40-50 billion. The range of quality products is very narrow because the good-quality products are sold also at relatively cheap prices, often with special distribution, and this does not encourage the enterprises to produce more of these good-quality products and it means a redistribution of incomes for those who can get hold of products in short supply. [paragraph continues]

I think that consumer prices must be proportional to society's expenditures and the relations between supply and demand. The only exception to this can be the case when there is a need to solve social tasks. Here, we should not experiment but we should simply carry out the price reform in order to attain normal price relations and make sure that the ruble's purchasing power is independent of who is spending it and how so we are thus able to speak about a uniform market.

The other thing is the need for an adequate delimitation between free and paid benefits. For example, in health care, the introduction of certain payment elements could contribute to the development of this sector; that is, because there is not enough money to develop it while the needs of the population are so great that many people would gladly pay, or if you like invest, in order to develop this sector. The biggest problem is housing because this has today become the particular instrument for redistributing income. If dwellings which are practically free are distributed through other channels and at the same time there are serious distortions in the system of consumer prices, then this will completely disrupt the system of distribution according to work done. In my opinion, we should not disturb the conditions of housing ownership and there is no need to withdraw from the socialist achievements we have attained, but we should expand the sphere of paid services, which will include an increase in housing rents and fair differentiation among them according to the location and quality of the housing in question.

[Zalai] In the Soviet reform debates, great emphasis is placed on social considerations. Why?

[Zaslavsakya] I believe that, in everyday life, these are the two sides of practically one and the same question, but in practice, in management, these sides are nevertheless not connected closely enough. This also reflects the division of scientific work. A considerable part of economists who are encouraging an efficient economic mechanism simply do not deal with the social consequences of the reform, claiming that sociologists should deal with them. Often, the opposite is also true, the sociologists claim that they analyze the structure of society and the economists should deal with the economic mechanism. Our Institute in Novosibirsk is almost the only one that is trying to analyze these questions as a united whole.

We are facing a huge task, the socialization of management itself because at present it is of a technocratic nature or at best of an economic one. When I speak about a technocratic way of thinking, I am far from accusing anyone. The leaders, including the majority of economic leaders, have an engineering or technological education. It is natural that a technical view is predominant in the case of engineers and that they relate to people as if they were machines, that is, they can be divided and regrouped.

The introduction of economic thinking began to be encouraged 30 years ago because people became aware of the fact that no one was counting the kopeks that were being spent. It was a difficult start but we advanced with great efforts. After all, the country had economists who raised this question. However, we have no sociologists. Their instruction began at four universities only 2 years ago. For the time being, sociology does not have even a real scientific rank in spite of the fact that it should play a great role in party and state decisions. First, we must ensure that the question whether sociology is a science or not does not even come up. Only then can a sociological training be spread and a social thinking can be shaped in reality. Of course, it would be foolish to state that no one is currently dealing with this issue. Journalists, writers, social scientists emerging as publicists, and the television are doing precisely that and are giving increasing scope to the analysis of social problems. And all these things serve to shape the social awareness.

[Zalai] Thank you for the interview.

MOSCOW TV BROADCASTS SOYUZ TM-2 LAUNCHING

LD060629 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2138 on 5 February carries a live relay from the Baykonur Cosmodrone showing the launch of the Soyuz TM-2 spaceship manned by Cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin.

This live report on the launch opens with shots of the two cosmonauts, Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin, seated aboard a bus transporting them to the launching pad. Accompanying them in the bus is the Cosmonaut Vladimir Dzhanibekov and another experienced cosmonaut, according to the Correspondent A. Galkin's commentary.

Pictures show an illuminated rocket standing on the launching pad in the darkness of the night. There is a cloud of vapor around the base of the rocket. Galkin says the launch will be from the Gagarin launching site, and a picture on screen shows a sign bearing the name Gagarin Launching Complex. Pictures show a distant shot of the rocket followed by medium close-up of top of rocket and supporting gantries. We are then told the bus is at the foot of the rocket, and the two crew cosmonauts are seen mounting steps. They turn and wave their right hands.

Galkin continues: "The bus is at the launching pad, close to the rocket itself. The cosmonauts still have a few steps to climb to the lift and then they are taken up to a height of 50 meters. The cosmonauts will now settle into their cabin. Then we shall be on the line to them." The two cosmonauts are seen mounting further steps and disappearing from sight. After a pause pictures from the crew's cabin show Romanenko and Laveykin occupying their berths. Romanenko is shown answering Galkin's questions on his feelings on this, his third launch.

Three people are then shown on screen in front of monitor screens. From left to right the line-up is an unidentified civilian, an unidentified cosmonaut and correspondent Galkin. They wish the crew a good flight. Galkin continues: "Well, obviously at the present time we are being seen only by those living in the European part of the country. Unfortunately, here at the cosmodrome it is already deep night, and the televisions are switched off. Well then on our screens here we can see the crew. I shall ask the producer to switch the camera to where the rocket is standing so that we can see it." The rocket is now shown standing on its pad with clouds of vapor obscuring lower half. Galkin asks about the vapor and the unidentified civilian responds: "Vapors from the liquid oxygen come through the drainage vents." "The rocket is coated with hoar-frost. It has become covered with hoar-frost and through the drainage vents there is evaporation of oxygen. The liquid oxygen is constantly topped up so the necessary amount of fuel remains in the tanks."

The unidentified cosmonaut says: "The 5-minute readiness order has now been transmitted. This is a technical process, which is taking place slightly ahead of schedule, that is to say, the operations are being conducted accurately. They have now announced 5-minute readiness for the crew."

Galkin then says: "At the present time we are not only watching the rocket and listening to the communication exchanges between the control group and the crew, but all the information coming from the launching complex here is being received at the flight control center, whey my colleague Aleksandr Tikhomirov is present. Over to you at the Flight Control Center." Now the scene at the flight control center is seen. A large illuminated display screen at the center shows the planned trajectory of the rocket to go into orbit.

Two adjoining smaller displays at left give indistinct details of flight. The top-right display panel carries television pictures. Various officials are shown seated at the control center. Correspondent Tikhomirov is seated next to Cosmonaut Feoktistov, who is dressed in civilian clothes.

Tikhomirov introduces Professor Konstantin Petrovich Feoktistov, USSR cosmonaut-pilot and Hero of the Soviet Union who outlines the flight.

Feoktistov says: The crew is setting off for the Mir station. In 6 minutes the crew will lift-off. During the first 24-hour period there will be a checking of sytems, that is to say, operations to check the orientation system in the main." "During this first 24-houir period there are to be two correcting boosts, that is to say, the engine will be switched on twice to start to raise the orbit and to start the process of rendezvousing. The rendezvousing is to take 2 whole days. This is somewhat unusual, since veryone has become accustomed to a docking on the following day." "Why then is this being done? The fact is that gradually the Mir station will increase its mass. Our module will be linked to it, and then another. To alter the orbit of such a heavy station each time before a docking, as was done previously, means a fairly large expenditure of fuel." "The process of rendezvousing will last not 1 whole day but 2." The spaceship will catch up the station during the course of the 2 days, so that there will be no need for a correction of the station's orbit." "On the following day the crew will be making another correcting boost, perhaps two, and then two correctioning boosts prior to the start of the process of automatic rendezvousing at the start of the 3d day."

Feoktistov explains in fuller detail what making a correction boost entails. He says that later the crew will be demothballing the station and preparing for their work, and then starting on conducting their experiments program. Feoktistov goes on to speak about the nature of the Mir station.

Tikhomirov then says: "Well then, there now remains less than 2 minutes before the launch. I had better hand over to Baykonur, because after all the main event is taking place there. Later we shall return once again to the Control Center, when the processing of going into orbit begins, that is, when the rocket tears itself away from earth and goes into space."

Back at Baykonur Galkin and the two with him are viewing the screens in front of them. We then see on screen the cosmonauts in their cabin. Galkin is told by one of his companions that it is a "book containing on-board instructions, which gives all the operations taking place during the process of going into orbit."

On screen Cosmonaut Romanenko is seen looking at his watch, and Galkin says that only seconds remain before blast-off. Galkin says that we can see the rocket from the window of the studio bus. Through the window the rockete is seen on its pad. The gantry is seen moving back from the rocket. A voice can be heard announcing frist "start-up" and then "ignition." Immediately flames can be seen pouring from the base of the rocket. The voice announces "preliminary" and then "intermediate", and then the rocket rises up into the sky with flames belching from its tail. Soon only the ball of flames is visible in the night sky. Lift-off occurs at 2138 GMT.

Back at the Flight Control Center pictures of the cosmonauts inside their cabin are being displayed on a large screen.

In their cabin the cosmonauts look little changed from their appearance prior to lift-off. Romanenko can be seen giving one of his frequent progress reports. For instance, here he reports "100 seconds, and the flight is normal".

Galkin reports that the rocket has now left the zone of activity of the cosmodrome services, and hands over to the Flight Control Center.

In the Flight Control Center Tikhomirov refers viewers to the large display screen at the center which reflects the whole process of the flight. On the screen an illuminated blip is seen gradually moving along its flight path to go into orbit. The cosmonauts are to be seen on another screen and their exchanges with ground control can be heard. The pictures show various officials present at the Flight Control Center. The blip on the central display marking the spaceship in flight is seen steadily progressing along its trajectory through the first separation stage and on to the second separation stage. A close-up of the display screen shows that it also includes data about the parameters of the flight into orbit, giving altitude in kilometers and speed in meters per second.

Tikhomirov and Feoktistov continue to talk about how stirring these launches are for cosmonauts and all those involved in space flights. Eventually the blip on the display screen reaches the third stage separation mark. Feoktistov says the engine is now turned off and the separation will now be taking place. The cosmonaut's voice is heard reporting that the spaceship is now 530 seconds into its flight. Tikhomirov adds that the spaceship can now be considered to be in orbit. The time is 2146 GMT.

The relay ends with Tikhomirov and Feoktistov congratulating Romanenko and Laveykin.

Control Center Notes Progress

LD060654 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 6 Feb 87

[Reportage from USSR flight control center by our special correspondent Sergey Zheleznyak]

[Text] At present the Soyuz TM-2 spaceship is above the North Atlantic precisely above Sable Island, off whose shores "Kosmonaut Yuriy Gagarin," the flagship of the Soviet space fleet, is standing. The latest communication session has just started. The crew and earth are summing up the results of the flight's first working day. All systems of the spaceship have been checked out and, most importantly, a two-booster maneuver has been conducted. Their aim is to create a so-called initial orbit from which rendezvousing with the station will start.

Now it is resting time. True, first Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveykin are to choose a lodging place for the night [mesto diya nochlega], perhaps on the wall or perhaps on the ceiling, -- in a word: whatever place takes their fancy. The first working day is over.